

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ASSISTANCE BY THE GREEN BERETS  
TO UNION COUNTY, S.C.

**HON. STROM THURMOND**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the outstanding civil action assistance being given to rural areas through field exercises conducted by the Green Berets of the U.S. Army.

During the first 2 weeks of March of this year, Company B, 5th Special Forces Airborne Green Beret unit from Fort Bragg conducted operation, "Orbit Run II, Field Training Exercise (FTX)," in Union County, S.C. This field training exercise had two goals. One was to provide the Green Berets with actual projects to complete for training purposes instead of simulated projects. Second, it was to help the county complete much needed facilities for the citizens in the rural communities of Union County.

Mr. President, according to the Honorable James W. Blackwood, mayor of the city of Union, the FTX was an outstanding success. Both the Army and the county benefited by this fine effort. Local National Guard units also participated and contributed to the successful accomplishment of the assigned missions, which included such recreational projects as swimming pools, basketball fields, ball parks, and tennis courts.

Mayor Blackwood advised me that the Green Berets were very impressive and won the hearts of all those citizens in Union County who were associated with them. He stated that—

The Green Berets shall be remembered for a very long time as gentlemen and soldiers.

Mayor Blackwood singled out the company commander of Company B, for special commendation. He stated—

Leadership by a very fine gentleman officer in the person of Captain Paul P. Mendes has been the key to the great success experienced by both the Green Berets and the citizens of Union County.

Mr. President, the Union Daily Times, which Mayor Blackwood forwarded to me, devoted a special section of its newspaper to an excellent news feature entitled "Berets Complete Orbit Run II." It presented this field training and domestic action exercise in a very interesting manner with photographs. This fine newspaper is to be commended also for its very informative article on this FTX which started with Company B parachuting into the area to commence operations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, for Mayor Blackwood's letter dated April 23, 1973, and the newspaper article published as a supplement to the Union Daily Times on March 22, 1973, to be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the material

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION, S.C., April 23, 1973.

HON. STROM THURMOND,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: Union County was very disappointed when told you would not be able to visit during Orbit Run II FTX.

Since you are on the Armed Forces Committee we feel a follow-up to this Field Training Exercise should include you.

Also Sir, we desire to give credit to the proper ones for this very successful operation. Should it have been a failure I'm sure you would have heard from it.

Sir, the Special Forces Airborne Green Beret from JPKCMA, Fort Bragg, N.C., shall be remembered for a very long time as gentlemen and soldiers. These men visited the homes, schools, churches and clubs—from the kindergarten to the Senior Citizens Center. No age group, race or religion was denied by these men. On one Domestic Action Project (Lukesville Recreation Park) in an all black section, one man worked in a down-pour of rain he was so determined to complete an outdoor cookout pit.

This is only one example of the devotion these men of the Green Beret put forth to do a good job.

Sir, you being a leader of men, and having served in the Armed Forces know there is no way to place value on a good leader.

Leadership by a very fine gentleman officer in the person of Captain Paul P. Mendes has been the key to the great success experienced by both the Green Beret and the citizens of Union County. This young officer is everything one could ever expect in a man, soldier and leader. Knowing this man is a wealth alone.

These men have visited Union County for training purposes twice in the past, and for a November 11th parade. Union County has been acquainted with them for approximately one year. Approval of plans to be back in Union on April 26, 1973 for a Military FTX were announced two weeks ago by Captain Mendes.

The thoughts I am attempting to express did not come over night. These men are very deserving of a pat on the back for a job well done for this County.

Sir I and the people of Union County will be grateful for any thoughts you may pass on concerning Captain Mendes and the personnel of Company B 5th SFGA Fort Bragg, N.C. for their outstanding work.

We know Colonel Earl Keesling, Commanding Officer, 5th SFGA would appreciate hearing from you.

I remain your faithful servant, and if I can be of service, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. BLACKWOOD,  
Mayor.

[From the Union (S.C.) Daily Times, Mar. 22, 1973]

**BERETS COMPLETE ORBIT RUN II**

The skies of Union were filled with the drone of aircraft engines on March 1, signaling the beginning of Orbit Run II, an exercise in self-help conducted by a company of men from the 5th Special Forces stationed at Fort Bragg, N.C. As the C-130 transport made its first pass over Berry's Farm, a chill of expectation rang through the warm morning air and the first contingent of men bailed out via static line at 2,000 feet to greet the some 2,000 onlookers present for the jump. A few minutes later the second team of men stepped from the aircraft at 16,000 feet and

perfected a High Altitude Low Opening (HALO) jump.

While the crowd present enjoyed watching the men land, Sgt. Griffin gave an oral explanation of the workings of the parachute and what the crowd would see as the men descended. Sgt. Griffin went into a detailed explanation and also deployed a chute on the ground so that the spectators might get a better perspective of what was happening.

Orbit Run II is an exercise in civilian-military cooperation and self help designed to provide training for both military and civilian personnel. The army, realizing the need to keep men of the Special Forces active, originated the program and has had numerous successes with it in other states. Although Union is not the first down in rural America to be visited by men of the Special Forces, it is interesting that it should be twice selected for exercises involving men of the 5th Special Forces. The first such exercise was kept secret until it was completed, September 1972. Code name for the project was Cabot Sound VI.

Upon successful infiltration into Union, men of the Special Forces were taken to the Union County Fairgrounds where they were to be housed until completion of the exercise, March 22. Several projects had been outlined and immediately A-Teams were assigned to their specific details of work. Although the teams involved do not represent a full complement of men (12), they were, throughout the problem, able to function and complete their assigned tasks under the direction of Capt. Paul Mendes.

The A 23 Team was assigned to the Powell Street Swimming Pool which prior to their arrival had been closed without much hope of reopening this summer. With the help of the city of Union Utility Department and the Union County Vocational School masonry class, members of the teams set to work to repair—rebuild and paint the pool. The first item on the agenda was draining the pool and cleaning the filtration system.

Having accomplished that which looked impossible with the filtration system, members of the team and local civilians went to work on the pool proper. In deplorable condition, the pool had cracked places in it, blisters, fungus infected walls, and sharp concrete edges which caused many cuts to feet last summer. All supplies and equipment used by both civilian and military personnel alike were borrowed or bought locally by persons, industries, and civic clubs working to help their community.

Although hampered greatly by bad weather, the team accomplished the job and when the State Health Inspector examined the pool, he stated, "it was in the best condition he had seen it in years."

The pool received three coats of epoxy paint, had all ladders and hardware primed and repainted and all blisters broken and reworked. Also painted was the bath house where A-Team members replaced clothes baskets, made doors and replaced commodes. Thanks to the Union County Vocational School masonry class, crew members of the City Utility Department, and equipment loaned by local National Guard units, the Green Beret, with local help, have made it possible for Union to open the pool this summer and have provided fun for our youngsters.

The second major project conducted by members of the Green Beret was not originally scheduled; however, upon arrival in Union a need was seen and met at Lukesville.

Affectionately known by members of the A-Team as the Lukesville "can and bottle

dump," members of the team set to work immediately with the help of some 200 local residents to police the field and prepare it for heavy equipment work. Prior to any work, however, Special Force members helped the residents of Lukesville to form a Men's Club which had gotten a lease on the property from United Merchants.

This project was hampered also by incessant rain and members of the team spent much time digging the heavy equipment out of the mud. Today the field, through the courtesy of the County Road Crews, has a good base of sand and top soil making the infield playable. In addition to leveling the field, the Berets helped construct a backstop and prepared an 18x18 area for a basketball court.

The residents of Lukesville, with the help of the county and the Buffalo Men's Club, learned from the Berets how they could help their community with a recreational facility that any area would be proud to have.

The third major project tackled by the Green Beret was construction of a ball park at Buffalo for the Buffalo Men's Club and the University of South Carolina, Union Campus. Before work could begin on the field, the Buffalo Men's Club procured a lease on the land from United Merchants and reached an equitable agreement with USC-U for their use of the field. Beret A-Team No. 3 then proceeded to clear the area for heavy equipment work. To stimulate interest in the work, members of the Green Beret Corps held a baseball game on the field the second day of work and local residents came out on top with a 13-3 victory over the Berets in a 9 inning tilt. The game served its purpose and for the rest of the work, local residents and kids were on hand to lend their hands to the work.

After leveling the field and removing obstructions from the outfield, sand and fill dirt were brought in to fill the gaps and holes. The old backstop was removed and replaced. In addition, a site has been leveled for the construction of a basketball and tennis court. Although again hampered by bad weather, the Berets, with the help of local townspeople, were able to complete the assigned task and the residents of Buffalo will enjoy the use of a fine field this summer as will the team from USC-U.

To date, all major projects have been completed according to Capt. Paul Mendes. "In addition to the construction work the Berets have done," said Mendes, "we have had other correlated activities with civic and service organizations in the community."

The Beret, in conjunction with Civil Defense authorities, conducted a simulated nuclear catastrophe and provided training for local CD officials in the event of a real emergency. Local groups such as the Fire Department, Rescue Squad and Boy Scouts received training in emergency first aid, transporting of victims, and emergency procedure.

Included in this instruction was repelling and evacuation of wounded persons via a medical helicopter. As each local personage completed the prescribed course of training, it was slowly realized by them that indeed they had been exposed to a learning experience that few have the opportunity to witness and gain knowledge from.

In conjunction with the Special Forces activities, local National Guard units were given and partook of the opportunity to conduct a training exercise in search and destroy tactics. Demolition experts from the Special Force Team rigged a village with booby traps and explosives simulating an actual attack. Members of local guard units attacked the village and destroyed the concentration of enemy forces. Witnessing this display were residents of Union County and the local

guard units used the opportunity for recruitment and reenlistment purposes.

The final show by the Green Beret and National Guard units was held Saturday, March 17, when a display was set up at the Union County Airport. Although bad weather and high winds curtailed much of the displays and prevented the aircraft from taking off, many people were on hand. Here again National Guard units used the opportunity for recruitment and re-enlistment.

Throughout the entire exercise, members of the Green Beret spoke to several civic clubs and schools in the area. At the schools, Excelsior who extended the first invitation to the Beret, were given the opportunity to have the students jump from a kiddie parachute tower. Enjoyed by all the children, each who participated in the jump received their official parachute jump certificate.

As Orbit Runn II comes to an end, it is noted that each and every action conducted by the Green Beret could have been done earlier by local residents. Through the Berets, the city and county of Union have come to learn that with some initiative, much can be accomplished. The Beret have shown the residents how as they have done in Vietnam and the rest of the world. And, as in the rest of the world where they have left, it is up to the local residents to continue their efforts in providing a better place for their people to live.

Capt. Paul Mendes stated that throughout the entire exercise, the help received from the local people was superb and that, they, not the Green Beret, accomplished what had been done.

#### ABE DOLGEN HONORED

#### HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1973, I was privileged to serve as chairman of the 11th annual Queens County New Frontier Regular Democratic Club dinner dance. This year's honored guest was Mr. Abe Dolgen, who is vice president of the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, also active in varied and many charitable works including chairman of Queens Histadrut.

In his remarks to those attending the dinner, my good friend Abe Dolgen touched upon issues of social justice which I believe will be of interest to my colleagues. For that reason I am placing excerpts from his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

#### REMARKS BY ABE DOLGEN

To have achieved through community and political activities, a measure of esteem and recognition from your co-workers and colleagues in the cause of good liberal government is truly rewarding. Therefore I am proud to have been elected First Vice-President of the Queens County New Frontier Democratic Club and honored beyond measure to have been selected as its "Man of the Year" and its guest of honor at the Eleventh Annual Dinner Dance on May 6.

The choice of a trade union leader as guest of honor this year is recognition of the important role of organized labor.

The fight for liberal government requires vigorous year-round organization if it is to produce victories.

We are very fortunate in our district to

have as co-leaders the able, energetic Sidney F. Strauss and the "Power House" Ann Schachter.

I am grateful to our distinguished Congressman Joseph P. Addabbo for serving as chairman of the Dinner Committee; also to Lillian Leigh, editor of our club paper and to Leo Schwartz, our club treasurer, for spearheading the arrangements and serving as Co-Chairmen.

It is an honor to have on the roster of the Dinner Committee Borough President Manes, Congressman Rosenthal, State Senators Santucci and Gold, Assemblyman Hevesi, Councilman-at-Large Mastropieri, and Hon. Matt Troy.

As a Trade Unionist I have always believed we must fight for social justice on the political and economic fronts. Working people need agreements with good wage and work standards and benefits. They also need social and labor legislation to complement their economic gains as citizens of a democracy. They are also interested in improving our society for the benefit of all its citizens.

To me the term "New Frontier" in the name of our club expresses willingness to explore new ideas and concepts for the decade of the seventies but it does not mean discarding sound liberal principles that have served our country well in the past. Let us work in the year ahead to forge unity within our ranks. This is the key to victory for our cause.

#### ISRAEL: 25 YEARS AS A NATION

#### HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, the World Zionist Congress established as its goal in 1897 "the creation of a national homeland for Jews in Palestine". This goal became a reality on May 14, 1948—5 Eyar, 5708, according to the Jewish calendar.

And yet, the 25th anniversary of this momentous achievement, the silver anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel, represents more than simply the celebration of a nation's statehood. It represents a milestone in the history of a whole people.

The story of the Jewish people has been one of a quest for homeland and for peace following centuries of homelessness and persecution.

Today, 25 years after the Jewish people began building a nation on the site of their historic homeland, the desert has bloomed. These brave people, under the leadership of some of the finest statesmen this century has produced, have developed economically, scientifically, and politically with a determination which is the essence of their spirit as a people.

And yet, these brave men and women are today still engaged in a struggle to maintain their national sovereignty and to conclude a lasting peace with their neighbors.

America, as leader of the free world, congratulates Israel on its 25th birthday, and wishes to this young country all possible joys and peace in the next quarter century.



# SAN DIEGO PROUD OF ITS PARTNERSHIP WITH THE NAVY

## HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, those of us from San Diego have always been proud of our partnership with the Navy. The sweeping realignments of bases proposed by the Navy will make San Diego the Navy's largest port, a banner our community is proud to fly. The close association the Navy and San Diego have had through the years is expressed quite eloquently in a San Diego Union editorial which I request be printed in the RECORD at this time.

The editorial follows:

### IMPORTANT NEW ROLE—OURS IS FOREMOST NAVY TOWN

A review of San Diego history since the turn of the century makes clear that an ideal harbor and year-round mild weather were not the only reasons the Navy and Marine Corps established so many training and operational commands in this area. Time and again our local officials, the business community and civic-minded citizens have shown a willingness to work with the services to assure that their needs could be met in the San Diego area.

Thus, as the Navy embarks on a sweeping reorganization and consolidation of its bases, the groundwork is already laid for the transfer of many activities to San Diego. Navy and Marine Corps installations in the area have the capacity for expansion. Our harbor and its naval stations have the ability to absorb an increase in the number of ships to be home-ported here. Our community as a whole will be prepared to welcome the 13,000 civilian workers and sailors to be transferred here between now and mid-1974.

Indeed, the manpower transfers will simply return the total number of naval personnel here to the level it had reached in 1969 under the impact of the Vietnam War. The transfer of ships will bring the total number based here to a figure well below the 200 operating from San Diego at the peak of naval activity in Vietnam.

What is approaching now, however, is not a wartime fluctuation but an assignment of new responsibilities to San Diego installations which can be considered as permanent as any can be in the light of changing defense needs. The Navy, more streamlined in this time of tight defense budgets and the experiment with all-volunteer armed services, has chosen to make San Diego its primary base.

This is a tribute to the hospitality San Diego has shown the Navy in the past, as well as a challenge to our community in the future. The immediate impact may lie primarily in providing housing for new Navy families, and in revising projected public school enrollments for the 1974-75 year and beyond. In the longer range, the prospect of a continuing high level of naval traffic in our harbor adds new priority to the question of constructing a second entrance to San Diego Bay.

The economy of San Diego and its neighboring communities today is less dependent than ever before on military spending. A diversity of manufacturing and service industries and the development of research and academic institutions has made San Diego in 1973 a far cry from the pure "Navy town" it was once reputed to be. Yet the important new role which this area will play in supporting the naval strength of the United States of America in the years ahead

makes San Diego the nation's foremost "Navy town" in a sense we may not have attached to the term before. We can wear the term proudly as San Diego and the Navy enter a new era of the historic partnership.

## CON GAME

### HON. JAMES ABDNOR

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues just another example of the widespread interest this Nation has taken in the confrontation at Wounded Knee, and why we must promptly evaluate the Indian situation.

I insert at this time an editorial from the Indianapolis News, of April 10, 1973. My distinguished colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III, brought this to my attention and I thank him for doing so.

## CON GAME

The performance of the Federal government toward the Indian militants who captured the town of Wounded Knee has been a masterpiece of liberal vacillation.

The disorder at Wounded Knee is an all-too-natural result of last year's episode when a group of hoodlums were permitted to wreck the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington, steal official documents, and walk off with a \$66,000 bribe from weak-kneed Federal bureaucrats. Having experienced that heady success, it was all but certain the collection of troublemakers, ex-cons and convicted felons masquerading as "Indian leaders" at Wounded Knee would get the message and come back for an encore.

For some reason the liberal commentators fawning over the so-called American Indian Movement don't tell us that AIM leader Dennis Banks has been convicted 15 times of charges including assault, battery, and burglary, or that the two Bellecourt brothers—one of whom was in Indianapolis last week—have both been convicted of burglary and armed robbery. Nor do they stress that the elected tribal leadership of the Oglala Sioux have repeatedly asked that the AIM interlopers be arrested and removed from Wounded Knee.

Of the 200 or so militants involved in the takeover, fewer than 20 were members of the Oglala Sioux tribe, whose leadership they professedly want to take away from its elected chairman, Dick Wilson. Wilson says he and other members of the tribe could have thrown out the militants in nothing flat but that "the Federal government ordered me not to . . . Apparently the representatives of the Federal bureaucracy preferred to cater to and negotiate with the ex-cons.

All that is outrageous enough, but there is more. The Detroit News reports that more than half the militants at Wounded Knee were employees of social welfare groups financed with Federal money, and that AIM itself received more than \$200,000 in Federal grants last year. The News quotes a Federal official as saying the Justice Department originally backed down on arresting the militants when AIM leaders threatened to publicize their Federal connections. So the takeover and violence have dragged out over the span of a month and a half.

The mess at Wounded Knee has been compounded of welfarism, permissiveness and capitulation to radical hoodlums, which should not be forgotten or written off with action against the militants themselves. The

whole affair cries out for congressional investigation and mass firings of the responsible bureaucrats.

## FRANCE FUELS MIDEAST TENSIONS

### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is well-known that Libya has become a haven for terrorists and airplane hijackers as well as financing armed insurrections in other lands.

When France decided to sell modern warplanes to Libya, French Prime Minister Chaban-Delmas gave solemn promises that France would not allow Libya to use the Mirage jets outside of its own territory, for aggressive purposes.

Now France has chosen to ignore this pledge.

American intelligence has confirmed that at least 18 Mirage jet fighters were sent by Libya to Egypt along with the necessary ground equipment.

In addition, Egyptians posing as Libyans have been trained in France by French technicians to both fly and service these fighter planes.

If there was still any doubt about Libyan intent, it was reported today that Libyan leader Qaddafi has pledged the use of his French-built planes to aid the Palestinian insurgents in Lebanon as soon as Bierut airport was captured.

If the French Government is to have any remaining credibility with the other nations of the world, it must immediately halt all further shipments of planes, spare parts, and ground equipment to the outlaw nation of Libya.

An excellent article in the May 2 issue of the Near East Report discusses the French attitude in greater detail.

The article follows:

### FRANCE LEADS AN IGNOBLE CAUSE

On the ground that Israel lacked "documentary proof," France rejected out of hand Israel's charges that Egypt has received at least 18 Mirage jet fighters from Libya, in violation of Libya's contract with France and France's own policy. Independent American sources have verified Israel's indictment, adding that Egypt has also received ground equipment and spare parts and that Egyptian pilots carrying Libyan passports have been trained in France.

The French response belies any pretense that the Pompidou government is "even-handed," the posture France assumed when Prime Minister Jacques Chaban-Delmas and his Defense Minister Michel Debré pledged to cut off Mirage deliveries if France's arms embargo of all "battlefield powers" were circumvented.

Indeed, France's behavior is entirely consistent with her deference to Arab clients, as illustrated by her role at the recent Security Council meeting, where France, along with Great Britain, pushed for the pro-Arab draft resolution to end aid to Israel and threatening economic sanctions—synchronizing with the Russian demand for Israel's expulsion. France led the outcry over Israel's alleged violation of Lebanon's sovereignty, even though Lebanon had compromised her integrity and international commitments by providing a haven and staging base for Arab terrorists.

In all this, France does violence to her conscience—and at the same time emboldens Israel's adversaries to follow her example.

Thus, Saudi Oil Minister Sheikh Ahmed Zaki Yamani warned during recent talks in Washington that his country might not be able to expand oil production to meet future Western consumption requirements because of the fear of terrorist outrages. (Secretary of State William P. Rogers is reported to have retorted that Saudi Arabia should stop subsidizing the terrorists as a first step toward curbing them.)

Fearful Europeans and Arabs seem blind to the fact that terrorism boomerangs.

The Saudi Arabian embassy in Khartoum was turned into a slaughterhouse by Black September murderers whose salaries have been paid by contributions extorted from, among others, oil countries and companies. And last week, Lebanon—haven for terrorists—became a terrorist target after Lebanese police made arrests following an attempt to smuggle bombs out of the country; when Lebanon rejected an ultimatum to release her prisoners, a time-bomb was planted at the Beirut airport.

When Arab political commentators recently crowed that Israel and the United States were becoming increasingly isolated, they were correct in a way they had not intended. They are isolated for their courage.

It appears that U.S. and Israel officials still have the temerity to spurn threats and to speak their minds honestly and openly. While the British were giving lip service to Egypt's peace initiatives, even though Egypt has not really changed its basic position, Deputy Secretary of State Kenneth Rush pledged in Teheran that the United States would maintain its firm Middle East policy "irrespective of whatever threats there are from anyone. We are not a country that bends to threats." While Britain's Delegate to the UN, Colin Crowe, was condoning Palestinian terror because it was not "official," U.S. Ambassador John Scali stated that "our energy crisis and the fact that most of the oil is in the Arab world will not ever be a determining factor in what our policy should be" in the Middle East.

Clearly, Israel confronts more than a double standard; she confronts a total absence of standards and principles. Crude expedience has always determined Soviet and Chinese Middle East policy; the amorality which increasingly rules European policy toward the area may be rationalized in the context of reliance on oil, natural geographic interests and investments which have to be protected—but it cannot be accepted or forgiven.

It has often been stated that a real peace in the Middle East will require an atmosphere of honesty and trust. The atmosphere grows more opaque and choking with each sur-render by countries like France to fear and threat.

#### A "PERSON," THE CONSTITUTION AND THE LAW

**HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM**

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, "No person shall be deprived of the right to life, liberty, or property, without due process of law"—Article 5, U.S. Constitution.

The people of America have been taught and told—and most believe in freedom, liberty, and constitutional rights of and for the individual.

Contemporary times have brought change—civil rights, chairperson instead of chairman or chairwoman, and other emphasis of nondiscriminatory expressions of equality before the law. The fact remains that no citizen or viable combinations of human living cells has a constitutional guarantee or right to life, liberty, or property. But all are entitled to a day in court pursuant to the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today in an effort to more adequately define the word "person" as used in the Constitution and the laws of the United States and to secure for the aged, the blind, the crippled, the poor, the rich, the sick, the unborn the same equal protection for survival before the law that we seek for ourselves. I respectfully request that my proposal be approved and published in the definition of a "person" as follows:

H.R. —

A bill expanding the definition of the word "person" as used in the Constitution and the laws of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I, chapter 1, section 1, the sixth clause shall be amended to read:

The words "person" and "whoever" include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals, and pursuant to the Constitution of the United States shall mean any animate combination of viable human cells capable of becoming an independent human being.

#### "PETE" HICKS—40 YEARS OF SERVICE

**HON. ELLA T. GRASSO**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, P. Francis "Pete" Hicks, of Winsted, Conn., will be honored on May 12 at a testimonial dinner given in appreciation of 40 years of tireless service to his fellow man—both as a volunteer and as a public servant.

"Pete" Hicks has served as a volunteer for the March of Dimes, an organization which, since it was founded in 1934, has brought hope and help to so many thousands afflicted with polio or birth defects. Over the years, he has served at all levels of the organization, first as Winsted chairman, then as Litchfield County fundraising director, then chairman of the Litchfield County Chapter, and finally as Connecticut State chairman for five terms. His leadership ability, enhanced by his genuine compassion for the suffering, has elevated the Litchfield County Chapter to the top position in the March of Dimes Region I which includes New England, New York, and New Jersey.

Yet, "Pete" Hicks' service to the March of Dimes has been only a part of his untiring and total service to his community and the State of Connecticut. Throughout his life, he has served his community in many official capacities. For five terms,

from 1947 to 1957, he was elected mayor of Winsted. During the great flood disaster of 1955, "Pete" became known as the Flood Mayor of Winsted. His unceasingly energetic efforts resulted in the almost unbelievable transformation of his beloved city from a ravaged area to a prosperous city. But, "Pete" Hicks' service did not end after he left the mayor's office. For 16 years he has served as chairman of the Winchester Flood and Erosion Control Board which has helped construct two dams to protect the Winsted area from a repetition of the 1955 horrors.

Mr. Speaker, for 40 years "Pete" Hicks has devoted his time and energy to the service of his neighbors and fellow citizens. His unselfishness, sensitivity, and heartfelt concern are qualities that are an inspiration to all of us.

I join with his many friends in Connecticut in congratulating "Pete" for a job well done, and wish him the best for years to come.

#### BILL WOULD MAKE GENOCIDE A FEDERAL CRIME

**HON. ROBERT McCLORY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the administration, and in accordance with recommendations made earlier by President Nixon, I am pleased to join today with my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. ROBINO), chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, in sponsoring a measure to implement the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

Mr. Speaker, the Genocide Convention was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948, and was entered into force in 1951. Although not yet ratified by the U.S. Senate, the measure was the subject of hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1970, and again in 1971, with the result that the committee gave the convention its approval.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I am today cosponsoring would make it unlawful to commit enumerated crimes against persons who are identified with a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.

I am confident that the measure is entirely consistent with our own constitutional principles.

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the measure which my colleague and I are introducing would vest no authority or jurisdiction in any United Nations or other international body, nor would the measure have any adverse effect on any State or local laws on the same subject as the measure which we are sponsoring.

Mr. Speaker, the overall effect of this measure would be to implement the agreement which is expected that our Nation will support through ratification of the Genocide Convention by the U.S. Senate—and establish Federal law which



would be consistent with the provisions of that convention.

# COMPENSATORY EDUCATION AND THE MISSING CHILDREN

## HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, representatives from the Bureau of the Census testified before the General Education Subcommittee. Of major concern to me has been the recently announced information by the Bureau that about 5.3 million persons were missed during the 1970 census. Since census statistics

form the basis for the distribution of funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, I am particularly concerned with the undercount of children.

Accompanying the formal testimony of the Census Bureau was the chart which I am asking to be reproduced below. That chart sets forth the net undercount of children under age 15 as determined by the Census Bureau. You will note immediately that the undercount of black children under age 5 shows the greatest error of any category for 1970, and in fact represents about a 50-percent increase in the percent of those uncounted in the 1960 census. Regrettably, figures for Spanish-surnamed Americans are not available. If they were, I suspect that they might be equally as high as those shown below.

I hope that these statistics, combined

with other problems inherent in use of census data for the distribution of educational funds, will convince all Members that we must seek other alternatives if we are to reach those children most in need of compensatory educational services. Unfortunately, according to Census Bureau testimony, the rate of error cited in the charts below cannot be applied to a State, a school district, or even a region since the rate of underenumeration is different in different areas. Undercount figures below the national level are simply not available.

I invite all Members to closely examine H.R. 5163, my bill to amend title I and remove the use of census data from the distribution of compensatory education funds. Explanatory remarks on H.R. 5163 can be found beginning on page H1404 of the Record of March 6.

The chart follows:

TABLE 7.—ESTIMATES OF THE PERCENT OF NET UNDERCOUNT OF CHILDREN UNDER 15 YEARS OF AGE, BY AGE, SEX, AND RACE: 1940-70

[Base of percentages in the corrected population]

Age and year	All classes	White		Negro and other races		Negro	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
UNDER 5 YEARS							
1970:							
Unadjusted.....	3.5	2.6	2.2	9.2	8.6	10.4	9.9
Adjusted <sup>1</sup> .....	3.5	2.3	2.0	10.3	9.7	10.4	9.8
1960.....	2.2	1.9	1.1	6.9	5.5	6.6	5.1
1950.....	4.7	4.3	3.6	10.0	9.3	9.6	9.0
1940.....	7.1	6.5	6.0	16.0	14.5	16.0	14.4
5 TO 9 YEARS							
1970:							
Unadjusted.....	3.1	2.7	2.4	6.5	5.7	7.8	6.9
Adjusted <sup>1</sup> .....	3.1	2.4	2.2	7.5	6.6	7.7	6.9

Age and year	All classes	White		Negro and other races		Negro	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
10 TO 14 YEARS							
1960.....	2.3	2.4	1.5	5.1	4.3	5.1	4.2
1950.....	3.6	3.0	2.4	10.6	8.9	10.4	8.5
15 TO 19 YEARS							
1970:							
Unadjusted.....	1.4	1.3	1.2	2.6	1.8	3.6	2.9
Adjusted <sup>1</sup> .....	1.4	1.1	0.9	3.5	2.7	3.5	2.8
1960.....	2.4	2.5	1.5	5.2	4.2	5.0	3.9
1950.....	1.8	1.0	1.0	6.2	6.5	7.2	6.0

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted estimates are based on census figures which have been adjusted for race misclassification in the complete count and for an overstatement of centenarians.

# CONNALLY'S CONVERSION

## HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, former Democratic Governor John Connally of Texas has switched his allegiance to the Republican Party.

Mr. Connally has held high positions as a member of the Democratic Party, including those of Secretary of the Navy and Governor of Texas. He was a close friend of former President Johnson, and at one time served in the Cabinet of President Kennedy. He served more recently in the Cabinet of President Nixon.

Certainly Mr. Connally seems to have no problems with his loyalties—and since the President has indicated that “an excess of zeal” on the part of some of his top-flight subordinates may have created problems, perhaps an adviser with Mr. Connally's attitude toward switching loyalty may be a useful asset to this administration at this critical juncture.

The Connally switch will definitely clear the air with reference to any professed loyalties to the Democratic Party.

History has shown that turncoats from Democrat to Republican have not done too well in seeking the presidency. Those who switched included a distinguished

Senator from South Carolina and the late Wendell Willkie of New York—both of whom after switching, ran for President and lost.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter, I place in the Record herewith an editorial and a column from the Washington Star-News.

The articles follow:

[From the Evening Star-News, May 3, 1973]

### CONNALLY'S CONVERSION

What John Connally's formalized conversion to Republicanism finally will amount to, in the larger affairs of the country, is anybody's guess at this point. He may be headed for the highest political summit, or toward some distant dead end. But one thing seems highly probable, despite the disclaimer of elective or appointive ambition: His statement yesterday was the opening bell in a three-year wrestling match for the Republican heavyweight championship.

It will be a polite affair for quite a while, we expect. For in the other corner, Vice President Agnew is a model of discretion, warmly welcoming the silver-haired Texan to the GOP fellowship. No doubt Agnew is taking the measure of his own considerable strength and making plans to build upon it, perhaps by enlarging his new image of moderation.

And who can say how many others—silent aspirants to the Republican presidential nomination in '76—are estimating the size of “Long John” Connally this week as if their political lives depended on it? What they see are some prodigious assets: robust charis-

ma, decisiveness, a style of super-salesmanship that he has employed with great effect as a four-term governor of Texas and presidential cabinet member. Connally comes on exceedingly strong—a bit too strong, some observers thought, in dealing with some foreign nations on economic matters, as Treasury secretary. In any case, the Republicans have acquired a new member, with far-ranging experience in government, whose energies will not be easily corralled. And one who is fully able, we suspect, to raise the financing required to support great political ambitions.

Nor is Connally short on political caniness. The timing of his party switch may turn out to be the best example of this, endearing him to a great many regular Republicans who otherwise might not have greeted him very exuberantly. For he has come to the Republican party in its darkest hour, when defectors outnumber recruits; calling for middle-road Americans to follow him away from the Democrats. In effect, he is offering to help pull the GOP out of the Watergate pit, and President Nixon surely will appreciate this expression of support even more than rank-and-file Republicans.

Connally's potential for ascent may well hinge on the depth of that appreciation, and specifically on whether he's called back to Washington for a leading role in refurbishing the image of a tarnished administration. But who knows at this juncture? More may depend on the light of developments still to come on whether the President can give a blessing beneficial to anyone in 1976.

So Connally has taken a gamble in which there are liabilities and uncertainties as well as assets. Even now President Nixon is taking

Agnew into the White House counsels—apparently giving him a much larger role in domestic decision-making. And a recent Gallup poll shows Agnew with more than double Connally's support among Republicans for the next presidential nomination. The come-lately stamp will not be easily overcome as Connally seeks support among Republicans. Some of them think he should have switched much earlier.

He has, after all, been a Democrat a long time, and a most aggressive one during the Republicans' long isolation from power. But the conservative "Solid South" (including Texas) was Democratic for a century, and it preceded Connally in shifting away from the old loyalty. If he can augment the GOP's gains in his native region, and help purge his adopted party of the Watergate blight, he may be hard to stop before 1976 rolls around.

[From the Evening Star and Daily News,  
May 4, 1973]

CONNALLY RALLIES ROUND  
(By Mary McGrory)

John Connally has made his move toward the White House while it is in a state of siege.

The Executive Mansion is, for the first time in history, occupied. FBI agents are guarding the files of a pair whom the President called, hours before the watch was put on, "two of the finest public servants it has been my privilege to know."

Every day brings its new batch of severed heads from the departments where the President had stashed away deserving campaign aides to keep an eye on suspect bureaucrats.

Republican National Committee employees are being closely questioned by the feds about their association with men who until last Monday spoke for Richard Nixon, and who are now speaking with the grand jury.

It was not, all in all, the ideal moment to announce one's conversion to the GOP. But John Connally who, like his Texas mentor, Lyndon Johnson, likes to keep his options open, had no choice.

The President has been waiting, with tapping foot, for a word of fealty from his chosen successor.

Other helpers have failed. Former Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said with a shudder that there were things about Watergate he didn't want to know. The Rev. Billy Graham, the President's favorite divine, failed the compassion test.

Connally, exquisitely barbered and tailored for the occasion, stepped boldly into the mire, proving to Richard Nixon that he is, in Johnson's immortal phrase, "a man you can get to the well with."

His remarks had a slight scent of camphor. They were obviously taken out of the chest where they were stored last summer after Connally became chairman for Democrats for Nixon.

The Republicans, he said, "represent the broad middle ground where we are going to have to find the solutions". That broad middle ground, in this season of floods, is under way.

Connally took a lofty view of Watergate. It will fall into the big picture, he explained. "Remember Peking" he seemed to be saying. The "great problems" to which he will address himself are the energy crisis, the trade agreements and inflation.

His arrival in the bomb shelter did not produce the general change of subject intended. The most immediate effect was on Spiro T. Agnew, who is undergoing conversion himself—or rather reconversion to orthodoxy. The vice president has been making strange noises about the morality of Watergate, threatening to resign if it seeped into the Oval Room.

With Connally now on the scene, Agnew will be driven into a competition of fidelity to the President. In one of the few actions taken at the White House this week, he had restored to him several duties which H. R. Haldeman had stripped away last winter. Apparently it was to comfort him against the advent of Connally and to indicate even-handedness.

Connally's aid to the party will probably take the form of rallying the demoralized troops around the country. At a melancholy Republican National Committee staff conference, a Texas representative urged the members to get in touch with John Connally—"he wants to hear from y'all."

Connally, who is large with the country-club and boardroom set which finds him more magnetic than Agnew, is expected to become a champion fund-raiser. Openhanded Republicans have been somewhat stingy since they found their contributions were being used as hush money for burglars.

The idea of Connally as a White House chief of staff is fading. In order to clean house, he might have to delve into past practices which cannot bear the light of day and could, ultimately, implicate the Oval Room.

With his untimely plunge, Connally has at least beat the "interloper" rap. Anyone joining the Republican party might be suspected of madness or martyrdom, but hardly of opportunism.

The President is doubtless grateful that Connally has rallied round the shredded flag. For the first time in his life, Connally may have done something that helps someone else more than it helps him. It is a sobering thought.

CLAIMS CONCERNING THE TREATY  
OF GUADALUPE-HIDALGO

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, a number of persons have consulted with me, in my capacity as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, concerning the claims that have resulted from the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo that concluded the Mexican-American War in 1848.

It appears, and it is alleged, that the legal, political and diplomatic status of lands that were the subject of royal grant from the King of Spain and thereafter from the Government of Mexico, prior to the consummation of the treaty, are in question, or at least deserve, further careful scrutiny. Involved here are not questions of U.S. sovereignty or its right to acquisition of the lands in the southwestern part of the country but rather the rights of the original grantees and their legal heirs.

This is not a matter that should be prejudged, based on claims now pending, however valid. In my judgment, the problem deserves careful study by an impartial body. I am, therefore, joining in the action taken by my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYBAL) in introducing a resolution calling for the creation of a special House investigating committee to study the issues and report back to the House within 1 year.

A SALUTE TO OKLAHOMA OSTEO-  
PATHIC HOSPITAL DURING NA-  
TIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today, as part of National Hospital Week, I would like to salute the largest osteopathic hospital in the Southwest, which is located in my district. In 1943, a small group of Tulsa Osteopathic physicians saw a dream come true when they met and pledged their futures. These men formed the Osteopathic Hospital Founders Association and purchased the 60-bed 30-year-old hospital at Ninth Street and Jackson. Today, after four expansions, the Oklahoma Osteopathic Hospital has 308 beds. The attending professional staff has grown to include approximately 160 physicians. Of an employee group of 836, nursing service comprises the largest single department, with 402 employees, making Oklahoma Osteopathic Hospital one of Tulsa's 25 largest employers.

Jon R. Pirtle, associate administrator, oversees the activities of a well-equipped, modern hospital with the necessary facilities to serve a growing city. Departments of General Practice, Radiology, Internal Medicine, Surgery, Anesthesiology, Obstetrics & Gynecology, and Proctology are headed and staffed by board certified physicians. Subspecialties such as cardiology, oncology, gastroenterology, thoracic surgery, pediatrics, pathology, and many others are practiced by osteopathic physicians with many years of training and experience. In light of the osteopathic philosophy, the general practitioner maintains a key role in health care delivery. General practice makes up the largest single department of the professional staff.

Sensitive to the health care needs of a rapidly growing city, Oklahoma Osteopathic Hospital is helping to meet those critical needs in many ways. Already the largest osteopathic hospital in the Southwest, OOH is presently undergoing its fifth expansion to almost double its size. The \$9.2 million project is under the direction of Mr. L. C. Baxter, executive director. The plan is dominated by a nine-level tower at the hospital's northwest corner. The first level will house enlarged emergency room facilities, physical therapy, inhalation therapy, and pharmacy. The second level is planned for an enlarged dietary department as well as educational facilities to include a new 1½ story auditorium and expanded medical library. The remainder of the high-rise tower will accommodate a new obstetrical floor and newborn nursery, 11 surgical suites, recovery areas, intensive care unit, and general patient care floors. Construction is scheduled for completion in the spring of 1975.

Another kind of building program is always in progress at Oklahoma Osteopathic Hospital: the "building of doctors" through its extensive medical education programs. Dr. F. L. Reed, di-



rector of medical education, supervises the training of up to 16 interns and 24 residents each year. In addition, the hospital is affiliated with the Kirksville College of Osteopathic Medicine for the clinical training of third year medical students.

Interns who complete their training at OOH are well prepared to begin general practice. In the course of 12 months, they have been exposed to a wide variety of pathology and have been well supervised in general patient management. If a physician's choice is to enter a specialty area of practice, his education is continued in residency training. OOH offers residencies of up to 4 years of additional training in the fields of anesthesiology, general surgery, internal medicine, neurosurgery, ophthalmology, orthopedic surgery, otorhinolaryngology, pathology, pediatrics, and radiology. The hospital and its staff make a sizable investment in these young physicians, who in turn, provide much needed health manpower to the State of Oklahoma.

#### THE SEA GRANT PROGRAM

### HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take note of the vote of increased confidence that the House showed in the national sea grant college program by the overwhelming passage of its renewal authorization. The greater amount of funding reflects well on both the value that the program has been to our Nation, and its great potential for future service in the gathering of knowledge for the proper husbandry of ocean resources.

The members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Congress, can point with pride at this program which demonstrates the effectiveness of careful oversight of a national determination to devote substantial funding to a concept which has and will prove its vital worth to the constructive use of the great resources of the sea in a program which utilizes the cooperation of scholars, students, and the community.

Donald E. Walker, the distinguished president of the new and exciting Southern Massachusetts University in North Dartmouth, Mass., where many of my constituents are enrolled, expressed tremendous interest in participating in the sea grant activities of research, education, and advisory services.

I do hope that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which deservedly boasts of its proud longstanding maritime tradition and one of the world's foremost research facilities at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute, will soon be able to play a greater role in the further development of this very worthwhile program.

### TRIBUTE TO THE REVEREND ARTHUR ROBERT BARTLETT

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1973, the people of San Pedro, Calif., will honor the Reverend Arthur Robert Bartlett—a man whose life's work has been devoted to the welfare of all merchant seamen through the Seamen's Church Institute.

Reverend Bartlett was born in England, but he was 3 years old when he arrived with his parents and sister in San Pedro where he has made his home ever since.

As a youth growing up on the waterfront, among the seamen, and other port people who made Beacon Street and San Pedro the famous and colorful—and somewhat raucous—place it was, young Arthur led an active life selling newspapers and magazines, and participating in scouting, football, baseball, basketball, and gymnastics.

During the summer of 1937, when Arthur was 17 years old, he became a paid summer staff member for the YMCA, and a charter member of the Phalanx Club, the YMCA's young men's group. It was during that time in his life that he met Frances Anderson, the girl who would become his wife 5 years later.

The next year he graduated from San Pedro High School and enrolled at Trade Tech, Los Angeles, where he completed a course in aeronautical engineering.

After attending Compton College and working in the Engineering Department of the California Shipbuilding Corp. for 3 years, he entered the U.S. Army and served until 1945 with the Air Corps as a B-17 instructor and armor gunner. While in the service in 1943, he married Frances; 2 years later, in 1945, his first son, Gregory Arthur, was born.

Returning to San Pedro and adjusting to civilian life once again, he was employed as an electrician for Bethlehem Shipyard and an appliance adjuster for Southern Counties Gas Companies. In 1947, his second son, Robert Sands, was born.

As the family grew, with a third son, Timothy Charles, being born in 1949, Arthur Bartlett became increasingly active in the PTA at White Point School, and Saint Peter's Episcopal Church in San Pedro. During the early 1950's, he taught Sunday School class, was a member of the local 20-30 Club, an active Cub Scout leader, and an area Boy Scouts commissioner. In 1952, he organized Boy Scout Troop No. 611 at White Point School; in 1953, he became a lifetime member of the White Point PTA, and a junior warden at Saint Peter's Episcopal Church; and in 1954, he became church school superintendent at Saint Peter's for 3 years, church summer camp dean for 2 years, and YMCA camp counselor for 3 years.

The year 1955 represents another

landmark in the life of Rev. Bartlett, as he became a volunteer for the Seamen's Church Institute—an organization designed to provide the stabilizing influences of church, home, and community to merchant seamen of all nations, creeds, and faiths.

A year later, he was a part-time employee at the institute, which led to his becoming the full-time program director in 1958. He also organized the first International Council of Seamen's Agencies conference on the west coast.

In 1960, Reverend Bartlett took a step which enlarged his already great commitment to aiding his fellowman—he became a candidate for Holy Orders, starting his theological studies at Bloy House and performing the responsibilities of lay chaplain at the Seamen's Church Institute. For the next 4 years, he attended Seminary at Bloy House, and Church Divinity School of the Pacific at Berkeley, where he was graduated in 1964, and ordained a deacon, Episcopal Church, on September 10. The following March, the Reverend Arthur Bartlett became an ordained priest and a priest associate, Order of Holy Cross.

Continuing his work at the Seamen's Church Institute, he became a member of the board of directors, International Council of Seamen's Agencies, and organized a committee for the first International Christian Maritime Agencies meeting in Rotterdam. He opened the first Long Beach Seamen's Center in a converted bus; became chaplain to the House of Hope for alcoholic women; opened Beacon House for alcoholic men.

In 1970, Reverend Bartlett was elected to the board of directors of the Southern California Halfway House Association; and he completed a summer course in alcoholic studies at the Pacific School of Religion.

This past year, 1972, the Reverend Bartlett, a grandfather three times, was elected president of the International Council of Seamen's Agencies.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to commend Reverend Bartlett and his many accomplishments and to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the outstanding contributions of the Seamen's Church Institute, where seamen can express joys and sorrows in an atmosphere of concern, and where seamen may become a little more whole again after months of isolation aboard ships.

#### ALL-YEAR DAYLIGHT TIME BILL GAINS 44 SPONSORS

### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I am today again introducing the bill to provide year-round daylight saving time. With the introduction of the bill today we will have 44 cosponsors of the legislation. The growing energy shortage has given us

another good reason not to turn back the clocks next fall. I believe this is an idea whose time has come, and would welcome my colleagues in the House joining me in an effort to enact the proposal.

The list of cosponsors follows:

#### COSPONSORS

Mr. Moss of California.  
 Ms. Abzug of New York.  
 Mr. Adams of Washington.  
 Mr. Bell of California.  
 Mr. Burgener of California.  
 Mr. Cleveland of New Hampshire.  
 Mr. Corman of California.  
 Mr. Danielson of California.  
 Mr. Derwinski of Illinois.  
 Mr. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Gude of Maryland.  
 Mr. Hanna of California.  
 Mr. Harrington of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Helstoski of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Hollifield of California.  
 Mr. Johnson of California.  
 Mr. McKinney of Connecticut.  
 Mr. Moakley of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. Mollohan of West Virginia.  
 Mr. Parris of Virginia.  
 Mr. Pettis of California.  
 Mr. Peyser of New York.  
 Mr. Podell of New York.  
 Mr. Rees of California.  
 Mr. Roncallo of New York.  
 Mr. Rosenthal of New York.  
 Mr. Roybal of California.  
 Mr. Wyder of New York.  
 Mr. Wyman of New Hampshire.  
 Mr. Collins of Texas.  
 Mr. Crane of Illinois.  
 Mr. Dulski of New York.  
 Mr. Eshelman of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Fish of New York.  
 Mr. Goldwater of California.  
 Mr. Horton of New York.  
 Mr. Ketchum of California.  
 Mr. Lehman of Florida.  
 Mr. Meeds of Washington.  
 Mr. Robison of New York.  
 Mr. Ware of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. Whitehurst of Virginia.  
 Delegate de Lugo of the Virgin Islands.  
 Delegate Won Pat of Guam.

#### HIGH PRICES IN THE SUPERMARKET

### HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, the people in Dade County are becoming increasingly distressed at the rise in prices that must be contended with everytime they go to the supermarket.

While they, nor more than I, are economics experts, I do not think that it takes such an expert to realize the consequences of the Russian wheat deal. Commonsense tells you that if you no longer can rely on a supply reserve, and something happens to the crop, chances are that the forces of supply and demand are going to boost prices in every sector that has a need for wheat or wheat products.

Likewise, my constituents have a great deal of trouble seeing the sense of subsidizing farmers, and some people who are not farmers, to not grow crops.

I would like to commend the attention

of my colleagues to a petition which I recently received from the Concerned Consumers of Dade County:

We request that our Representatives in Washington urge that there be Congressional action taken immediately to curtail the exports of grains, soybeans, animals and meat until we can determine the effects of this year's adverse weather conditions on crops and livestock, as well as the cumulative effects of a fuel shortage and labor union wage hikes throughout the food and transportation industries upon food prices in the next two to five years. We urge an injunction against union wage increase negotiations for at least a 90-day period.

We urge that subsidy money be used to support farm income and production, making it beneficial for the farmer to produce and sell first to America, selling only "true surplus" to foreign countries.

We request that a Congressional investigation be instituted to determine the causative factors of the radical meat price increase in a two-week period in mid-February; and subsequent, equally inequitable increases on all other foodstuffs. And, we would request that measures be taken to control these causative factors.

Respectfully submitted,

(Mrs.) MARGE BOLDIN MILNER,  
 Chairwoman, Concerned Consumers of  
 Dade County, and National Consumer  
 Congress.

#### THE TRUTH JANE FONDA CAN'T SEE

### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, "To see ourselves as others see us," as the poet Robert Burns said, is a gift many of us do not possess. Certainly Jane Fonda stands out as a prime example of this bit of verse. Unwilling to see the duplicity of her North Vietnamese comrades in her "arranged" meetings with the prisoners of war in Hanoi, she has lashed out at these valiant men as "hypocrites and liars." Frankly, I'll take these "hypocrites and liars" any day and am certain that 99 and 44/100 percent of the American people feel likewise. Whether she was duped by the North Vietnamese or went into the entire affair with eyes wide open, her behavior was inexcusable. I ask unanimous consent to include the following editorial from the Daily Californian as part of my remarks.

#### THE TRUTH JANE FONDA CAN'T SEE

Despite volumes of testimony by returning POWs that they were the victims of inhumane treatment and torture at the hands of their North Vietnamese captors, actress Jane Fonda refuses to believe them.

So enchanted has she become with the Marxist gospel that it is beyond her comprehension the regime which she served so well as a propagandist during the war could be guilty of such reprehensible conduct.

According to Miss Fonda, the POWs are "hypocrites and liars." She gives full faith and credit only to the statements of the eight POWs she met in Hanoi who were trotted out for her inspection and who insisted they had been well treated.

We can understand why Miss Fonda must now resort to absurd accusations which attempt to cast doubt on the veracity of stories told by numerous POWs. Having been used as a shill by a Communist regime she blindly believed to be humanist, she does not want to admit that those rambling speeches she gave on campuses across the country, portraying the North Vietnamese as philosophical descendants of St. Francis of Assisi.

Miss Fonda has been found out. She has been exposed as a sucker for the myth that all the evil in the world sprouts in the capitalist system. Her Hollywood fantasy of the North Vietnamese as paragons of virtue has been shattered by the words falling from the lips of the POWs.

How disillusioning it must be to discover—and not want to admit—that the "good guys" for whom you've been rooting aren't that good.

#### SCHOOLBUS SAFETY

### HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee is this week holding public hearings on schoolbus safety legislation. I am today reintroducing, with 18 cosponsors, a measure I proposed in the 92d Congress to require that schoolbuses be fitted with high backed seats and seat belts, so that this may be considered in the context of a bill of any larger scope which may ultimately be reported out by that body.

The need for legislation of this type is apparent if we look at data supplied by the National Safety Council and the Department of Transportation for the last few years. The trends evident from this data show that we can expect upward of 100 student deaths in schoolbus accidents annually in the United States, and some 4,000 student injuries.

Furthermore, it was asserted by various experts that many, if not most, of these casualties could be averted simply by extending Federal safety criteria developed for common carriers and passenger automobiles to schoolbuses as well.

There are several bills currently pending in the House which deal with the structural characteristics of schoolbuses. I agree that surely the structural integrity of the vehicles we build to carry schoolchildren is as important as that of vehicles we build to carry cross-country travelers.

However, I am particularly concerned that none of the current measures pending before the subcommittee adequately addresses the problems of seat belts and passenger seats themselves.

The National Transportation Safety Board studies several years ago indicated that many schoolbus casualties result from bodies flying about in a bus during an accident and coming into contact with hard or sharp objects.

Furthermore, the studies indicated that the installation of seatbelts in



existing schoolbus seats by itself might cause more casualties than it would prevent—either from the whiplash effect or from the occupant striking the metal handholds and seat backs that are common in most schoolbuses in use today.

The best answer, then, in the opinion of the NTSB, appeared to be a combination of approaches, specifically the installation of seat belts on properly padded seats with backrests at least 28 inches high.

My bill would require that seat belts be installed in all existing and future schoolbuses. It would also direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish adequate standards for safe seats. And, finally, realizing that the retrofitting of a fleet of existing buses with this equipment will be expensive, this legislation authorizes the Congress to appropriate funds necessary to assist local schools in financing the necessary changes to existing equipment.

Hopefully, through such measures as these we will be able to greatly reduce the number of casualties our children face each year with existing school buses.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance and its distinguished chairman, Mr. Moss, for the energy and effort they have put into legislation surrounding schoolbus safety. As I have indicated, hearings are currently underway on this general subject in that body.

However, I again urge the members of this subcommittee to include specific measures such as these I am today introducing in any comprehensive bill which may be reported. The merit of specific provisions for occupant restraint systems and better designed seats for schoolbuses has been made clear on numerous occasions by the National Transportation Safety Board investigations and hearings I have mentioned. The sooner standards are implemented, the sooner it will be possible to reduce the annual tragedy of 100 student deaths and 4,000 student injuries in schoolbus accidents.

#### BATTLE OF CORAL SEA

#### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 31st anniversary of the Battle of the Coral Sea. This was the battle that stopped the southward advance of the Japanese in the Pacific and, although it could be considered a "draw" rather than a victory, it inflicted enough damage on the Japanese fleet so that the Battle of Midway, a month later, was a decided victory and, indeed, the turning point of the Pacific war.

Coral Sea was the first and only battle of its kind in which two carrier fleets fought each other through air power alone, never coming in sight of one another. The battle prevented a Japanese invasion of Australia, and because of this

it has been commemorated in that country in week-long celebrations for many years.

No similar recognition was ever awarded to the Battle of the Coral Sea in this country. Indeed, it has been largely overlooked in historical accounts of the war, since it was overshadowed by the Battle of Midway. Some veterans of the Battle of Coral Sea, believing that it was too important an engagement to be thus neglected, organized in 1969 the Battle of the Coral Sea Association, Inc., and last year this organization sponsored the first American reunion in honor of the battle, held in Norfolk, Va., in May 1972, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the engagement. A group of 33 Australians came to the United States to attend the reunion, and the Australian Ambassador, Sir James Plimsoll, was one of the main speakers. The association plans to go to Australia in 1975 to attend the Coral Sea celebrations in that country.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of words have been written and spoken about the last world war. But on this historic date, I call the attention of my colleagues to the deeds of the men who served at Coral Sea. And I note with sorrow the recent passing of Adm. Jack Fletcher, who commanded that task force at Coral Sea.

#### ISRAEL

#### HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute today to Israel on the occasion of their 25th anniversary. Despite a series of conflicts, and continued hostility from neighboring Arab States, the ancient land of Canaan has seen more progress in the last 25 years than in the last 2,500.

Since its creation in 1948 Israel has absorbed every immigrant who managed to escape from East European countries.

Including settlers from other parts of the world, the total immigrant inflow is set at 1.5 million. The total population rose from 900,000 at the end of 1948 to over 3 million today.

I think it most appropriate on this occasion to insert for the RECORD, a statement by Prime Minister Golda Meir, contained in a special supplement of the May 6 edition of the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin:

#### NATION'S ANNIVERSARY RECALLS PEOPLE'S TRIALS

(By Mrs. Golda Meir)

Twenty-five years are but a brief moment for a nation with a memory more than 35 centuries long. Yet for us this quarter of a century bears the quality of a wonder; the third era of independence of the Jewish people in the Land of Israel came 1,878 years after the destruction of the Second Temple in Jerusalem by the legions of Imperial Rome, and only three years after the end of the Holocaust, in which German Nazis and their European collaborators murdered six million Jews—one-third of our nation.

The greatest catastrophe in the history of

the Jewish people was followed by the indomitable act of national redemption. Within the span of a few years we experienced the agony of knowing our people massacred defenseless in the towns, villages and death camps in Europe; and the realization that in Israel the Jewish people is again master of its own destiny and capable of defending its own life.

For nineteen centuries the Jews lived as a dispersed and persecuted minority throughout the world. Humiliation, expulsion and slaughter were the fate of our people in the countries of Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. For all those long centuries of suffering, our people clung to the hope of Return, prayed for it, dreamt of it. Every century some returned to the Land, keeping the Jewish community here from extinction.

During the past century, the Return became a movement of national renewal. Zionism meant that Jewish life could be recreated with roots in the Land; a land that we found in large parts barren and desolate. Jews now became workers, farmers, soldiers. From a minority we were transformed into an independent society, with its own language, institutions and democratic practice. In 1948, for the first time since the first century of the Common Era, the Jewish people became independent in their own Land; the State of Israel was established and joined the family of nations.

During the 25 years of its independence, Israel has been concerned with four main human efforts:

First, to defend our independence and assure the survival of our nation;

Secondly, to make Israel the home for Jews from all corners of the earth, whether in need of refuge or in search of an independent Jewish identity;

Thirdly, to develop as a human society, preserving ancient Jewish values, yet responding to the needs of a modern democracy.

Fourthly, to develop our material resources and give our people a better quality of life.

Defense and survival have been a major effort in our life, because the Arab Governments have so far refused to accept our right to live as an independent nation. Persistently they have sought to put an end to the existence of independent Israel and to deprive us of our right to live as we choose. Israel has known only armistice lines—until 1967—and since then only cease-fire lines. We have never known frontiers of peace, and even between wars the Arab Governments have intermittently directed terror and violence against our people. They have violated armistice agreements and cease-fire accords. They have conducted economic warfare against us. They have launched against Israel and the Jewish people virulent propaganda riddled with anti-Semitic venom.

To assure the survival of our nation, the Israel Defense Forces have evolved as a people's army. It is an army where our sons and daughters serve, often within sight of their homes; ours is an army for which the supreme objective is not war but the prevention of war. It is not an army bound for conquest; but an army utterly zealous in the defense of our lives and independence.

Peace with our neighbors, and not war, is the paramount quest of our people.

While seeking peace, Israel continues to foster in the areas administered since 1967 the conditions which we hope will be part of the peace settlement. These are—the open frontiers between the population of Israel and the Arab population of the areas; and the Open Bridges policy which, in the summer of 1972 alone, enabled more than 150,000 Arabs from neighboring countries to visit Israel. Full conditions of peace will be realized when we can reciprocate such visits—to Amman, to Beirut, to Cairo.

Although for 25 years we have been denied

peace, we have remained faithful to the central destiny of Israel: to be a haven of the Jewish people. Within three years after the independence, immigration doubled the population of Israel. By 1973 more than one and a half million Jewish immigrants had arrived. We have absorbed the Jews of Europe, refugees from the Holocaust, and the Jewish refugees from Arab countries—whose number is almost identical with that of the Arabs who became refugees during the 1948 war. We must remember that Jews had lived in Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and Libya for over two thousand years—indeed from times preceding the Arab occupation of those lands. With the departure thence of the entire Jewish communities, the long history of the Jewish minorities in those countries is coming to an end. Perhaps this transformation of the Jews—from a minority group living on sufferance into an independent nation—is what some Arab rulers find hardest to accept.

During the past few years, after a long and bitter struggle over their rights, Jews from the Soviet Union have begun to reach Israel. The Jews of Silence, as they were known, are no longer silent; but the struggle for their rights continues. Above all, this is a struggle for national self-determination, by Jews whose single demand is to be free to leave a society which practices anti-Semitism, discrimination and suppression, and denies them the rights of national identity.

#### AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION

#### HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, it is most unfortunate that the average American is unaware of the amount of misinformation being circulated about the House Committee on Internal Security, which I have the responsibility to chair. For some time, a campaign of falsehoods and vilification has been directed against the committee by some unwitting and some subversive elements.

It has come to my attention that the March 1973 issue of *Civil Liberties* published by the American Civil Liberties Union reveals that the ACLU has singled out my Missouri colleague, the Honorable RICHARD W. BOLLING, chairman of the House Select Committee on Committees, as the most important House Members to whom letters should be directed. "Ten Reasons to Abolish HISC" are set forth in the publication and readers are urged to use "any or all of these reasons" in writing to my distinguished colleague.

It is interesting to note that the "Ten Reasons to Abolish HISC" listed in ACLU's publication are identical with those which have been circulated by the National Committee Against Repressive Legislation, a registered lobbying group which seeks to stop all inquiries whatsoever into subversive activity. Last January 9, I addressed the House as to the false charges and distortions which appear in many of these arguments. On that occasion, I also reported on the history and leadership of the NCARL. For the benefit of Members who may want to refer to my remarks they may be found

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 9, 1973, beginning on page 537.

I realize it is unpopular to speak out against an organization which purports to aid the cause of civil liberties. I do not question the right or freedom of the ACLU to publish anything it wishes, whether accurate or not, but it does seem to me it has a moral obligation to assure itself of the accuracy of alleged statements of fact about a duly constituted agency of the Government. Neither the NCARL nor the ACLU took the trouble to check its purported allegations relating to the committee prior to the publication of its charges. Had they chosen to have done so, it would have been clear to both organizations in what respect the information was inaccurate.

The effect of the ACLU action is to create in the minds of the ill-informed the impression that it is wrong for the Committee on Internal Security to investigate the activities of those seeking to destroy American institutions. The ACLU seems to believe that law enforcement agencies, courts and congressional investigative committees can be dispensed with in a civilized society. The opposite is the case. Law is not the enemy of freedom—it is its prerequisite. Where there is no law only anarchy rules. It is regrettable that the ACLU does not seem to understand this fundamental principle. I have stated previously that ACLU appears to have lost the acumen to distinguish between the words libertarian and libertine. Their action in the instant case reinforces the validity of my statement.

As chairman, my cardinal precepts for the Committee on Internal Security include the highest standards of personal and professional conduct, prompt and complete handling of investigative assignments with absolute impartiality, and no deviation from full protection of individual rights and privileges. The committee will certainly not turn its back on its House-mandated responsibilities just because of misguided critics.

Many letters and telegrams have been received by Members of Congress during recent months from individual citizens in various parts of the country who have heard that a campaign was being conducted to abolish the committee. They have written and telegraphed to urge that everything possible be done to see that the committee's work be continued. These letters and telegrams are spontaneous expressions of the feelings, the concerns and beliefs of American citizens. They are not the results of an organized campaign such as being conducted by the ACLU and the NCARL.

The March 1973 issue of ACLU's publication calls on readers to write to their Congressman "urging him to vote for bills to abolish HISC" and even asking the reader to fill out a coupon printed in the publication to indicate the name of the Member of Congress to whom a letter was written and the nature of the Member's reply. The ACLU is a tax-exempt organization. Internal Revenue laws which exempt corporations and other forms of associations from the payment of income tax and provide deductible status to donors thereto, specify that "no substantial part of the activi-

ties" of these groups may be for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Accordingly, I have written to the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service calling his attention to the ACLU activity in light of its tax-exempt status.

As part of my remarks, I include the text of my letter to the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY,  
Washington, D.C. April 30, 1973.

Mr. JOHNNIE WALTERS,  
Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR COMMISSIONER: Enclosed for your information is a copy of the March, 1973 issue of *Civil Liberties* published by the American Civil Liberties Union relating to its campaign to abolish the House Committee on Internal Security.

You will note that the ACLU is sponsoring a letter-writing campaign to Members of Congress urging them to vote for bills to abolish the Committee. Further, the ACLU has requested that a coupon printed in the above-mentioned issue of *Civil Liberties* be filled in and returned to the ACLU, listing the name of the Congressman to whom a letter has been directed and indicating the nature of his reply.

It appears that the ACLU has undertaken a major lobbying effort to influence legislation. This would appear to me to possibly be in violation of regulations relating to tax-exempt organizations. Therefore, I ask that you look into this situation and furnish me with a report setting forth your comments and observations as to whether this is proper conduct for a tax-exempt organization.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,  
Chairman.

#### INDOCHINA WAR

#### HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, citizens all around the Nation are expressing their concern and frustration over the continuation of U.S. military activity in Indochina. The bombing of Cambodia has no legal basis other than the inherent power of the Executive and the passive compliance of the Congress.

This week we have a chance to reverse this trend and begin to restore to Congress some of its constitutional war power authority. By passing the Addabbo amendment to the second Defense Department supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1973, we will be defeating funds that would be used, directly or indirectly, to cover the U.S. bombing of Cambodia, both past and future.

As an example of citizen concern and initiative with regard to this vote, I insert in the RECORD at this point an advertisement which was placed in the Washington Post of May 8, 1973 by the Ad Hoc Committee To Stop Illegal U.S. War in Southeast Asia.

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES  
DON'T DECLARE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA AGAIN

Federal courts have held that congressional authorization of war funds amounts to a de facto declaration of war!



HR 7-447 as approved by the House Appropriation Committee on May 3rd contains a provision authorizing the Pentagon to transfer an additional 430 million dollars in appropriated funds for war use in Southeast Asia.

Administration witnesses have testified that 130 million to 150 million dollars of the 430 million would be used to pay for bombing Cambodia!

Don't pass another "Tonkin Gulf resolution!"

President Nixon in his foreign policy report to Congress on May 3 threatens renewed hostilities against North Vietnam!

Don't give the administration authorization to go to war in Cambodia and renew U.S. participation in the war in S.E. Asia!

We've got our prisoners back! One decade of war in Vietnam is enough!

Vote to delete the Pentagon request for increased authority to transfer appropriated funds from HR 7445.

### THE CHANGING OF TIME IN CHANGING TIMES

#### HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, time is life—life is time. The change of the clock can change neither. All of us want more of both and the older we grow the greater the desire—with few exceptions.

In our fleeting wisdom of changing times—we have changed the time. Some want more time at the end of the day and others at the dawn of day. But there is no change in the day or night. There is only so much time like 12 inches to a foot and 3 feet to a yard—and by whatever measure we cannot change the distance from "here" to "there." And neither by whatever measure at our command can we change the fleeting time. The composite of dawn, of day, of dusk and night is life. And so it will be as long as there is a heaven and an earth. Yet, with the shift of a great majority of the people from the earthly beauty of nature to the industrial age of a frustrated society in America—we sought a longer evening of play, time away from work, the office, shop, and store. Many seek escape to the "greens," the lakes, picnics, races—all in desperate search of time. All back to the country—the out-of-doors and to the quiet of the earthly beauty of nature.

Now, the minority live on the land in our country today—closer to nature and destined to the earthly duty of the soil warmed by the sun and not by the hour of the man-gear measure of time.

The animals, the birds, the flowers, the grains, the grass, the moss and all earthly life is subject to the nature of the sun as a measure of time. And so are we.

I propose a modification of existing law in the adjusted course of time. Any arbitrary proposal to move the measure of time ahead or back will fail the satisfaction of all. However, absent of emergency, the longest days resist erratic adjustments with the least amount of impact upon nature.

I, therefore, propose to amend the existing statute to limit the so-called "Daylight Saving" time to the period commencing at Memorial Day and ending at the close of Labor Day. It is a compromise for those that seek more and those that seek less. It will hurt none. It will be appreciated by many—and particularly by the young that in darkness seek schools of knowledge in the cold mornings of autumn and winter.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a copy of my proposal to amend the existing law. I am hopeful the Present Statute can be amended without delay. The publication follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Uniform Time Act of 1966 to provide for daylight saving time for the period beginning May 31 through Labor Day annually

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(a) of the Uniform Time Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 260a(a)) is amended by striking out "the period commencing at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of April of each year and ending at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the last Sunday of October of each year" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period commencing at 12:01 antemeridian on May 31 of each year and end at 12:00 midnight on the first Monday after the first Tuesday in September of each year".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall apply in calendar years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

### ISRAEL'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

#### HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 25th anniversary of a great moment in history, the establishment of the new nation of Israel.

This brave nation's courageous leaders and citizens have, over the past quarter-century, carved from the desert a bastion of freedom that should reinspire all dedicated Americans to increased respect for our own freedom and liberty. On personal visits to Israel, I have been so re-inspired.

The determined dream of a Jewish national homeland has become a thriving reality. Israel is a focal point for all men and women who look upon justice and freedom as inalienable rights. I welcome this opportunity to renew my support for the preservation of this brave young member of the family of nations.

I wholeheartedly endorse America's strong bipartisan foreign policy that is committed to Israel's survival. I am proud that I have voted to provide Israel with the means of deterring aggression while we work together to explore every means of deterring a renewal of hostilities and promoting a lasting peace in the Middle East. In addition, I reaffirm my support for Soviet Jewry. While the infamous "education tax" has been sus-

pending, I hope that Moscow will affirm the suspension as a permanent Soviet policy. The plight of Soviet Jewry must be permanently allayed.

The traditions that built the United States are being tested anew in the much smaller, but no less determined, nation of Israel. Their goals of freedom and justice deserve our support, our hope, our promise and our prayers.

### U.S. PENSION PLANS: FACTS AND FRICTIONS

#### HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I have long been concerned about the need for pension reform, and have sponsored legislation regarding individual plans, funding, vesting, and standards. Recently, I had the opportunity to review a very excellent four-part series in the Christian Science Monitor which presents many of my own concerns and thoughts. For the review of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

### U.S. PENSION PLANS: FACTS AND FRICTIONS—MANY RETIREES ARE DISAPPOINTED

(By David T. Cook)

BOSTON.—A pension usually isn't a promise. It's a probability.

The order of events for retiring American workers is thus sometimes: gold watch, farewell handshake, unhappy surprise.

About half of this nation's full-time non-farm labor force—some 35 million workers—are covered by privately run pension plans.

Some of those covered will be surprised. Critics and supporters of the plans disagree on how many. But they agree that there is a difference between being covered and actually collecting benefits at retirement.

Critics charge that workers would get better benefits and fewer surprises if:

Irrevocable pension benefits were granted to workers at an earlier age and after a shorter time with an employer.

Employers amassed funds to pay for promised benefits at a more rapid rate.

Tighter federal controls were imposed on the management of pension-fund assets.

Employers were required to insure promised pension benefits with a federal corporation.

### SIMPLIFIED LOOK

A simplified look at the design of a pension plan could prevent an unwelcome surprise at retirement. It may also make it easier to assess both criticism of the private pension system and legislation pending before Congress to change it.

Consider the case of Hypothetical Hotplate Company, a small manufacturing firm. Its directors decide to set up a pension plan to supplement retirement benefits their employees will get under social security.

Hypothetical officers first decide what the firm can afford to spend on a pension plan. A number of factors determine what level of benefits the firm can provide for this price.

For most U.S. firms, the rate of employee job hopping is one of the most important considerations in estimating pension costs. Employees can't collect pension benefits until they are vested. Benefits become vested when a worker is given an irrevocable right to collect a pension even if he leaves the firm before retirement.

## VESTING REQUIREMENTS

The stiffer the vesting requirements, the harder it is for an employee eventually to collect benefits. Hypothetical decides to require employees be on the job 15 consecutive years and reach age 45 before their benefits become vested. A Treasury Department study indicates these vesting requirements are typical of a majority of U.S. firms.

Vesting requirements coupled with an assumed rate of employee job changing can mean that a significant but disputed number of employees will quit or be fired before their pension benefits become vested.

Recent social-security data indicates that half of all men between 60 and 64 have worked less than 15.4 years for any one employer, and so would not meet "average" vesting requirements.

In designing its pension benefits, Hypothetical Hotplate assumes some of its employees will die or be disabled before they reach retirement age and collect benefits. This is a standard assumption.

Whatever money Hypothetical sets aside to fund (pay for) pension benefits probably will be invested. The firm decides to hire a bank or other professional adviser to handle the investment of its pension funds. Most private firms make the same decision. The reason: The higher the rate of return Hypothetical's advisers achieve on invested funds, the less the firm has to pay to provide workers with a given level of benefits.

The assumed rate of return on invested pension funds is thus of major importance in setting a firm's pension benefits and costs.

Estimate of foreseeable inflation and wage hikes also are considered in determining a benefit formula. Hypothetical's benefit formula is typical. An employee's annual wage is multiplied by 1 percent. The product, expressed in dollars, is called a benefit credit.

## CREDITS KEPT SEPARATE

In the firm's pension-fund accounting, each employee's annual benefit credits are accumulated separately. If a worker stays with Hypothetical Hotplate long enough for his benefits to vest, they will be paid back to him during the period of his retirement.

Critics and supporters disagree on how effective the private pension system is in providing retirement benefits to workers it covers. There is little disagreement about the system's massive size and impact.

Private pension plans have combined assets of some \$157 billion, according to the latest industry figures. These assets are growing at a rate of about \$10 billion a year.

Private pension coverage is concentrated among employees of manufacturing, transportation, and mining firms, according to government statistics. Sales and service workers are sparsely covered.

## EFFECTIVENESS DISPUTED

The system's effectiveness in getting benefits to those it covers is disputed.

A Senate labor subcommittee study suggests only 10 percent of those enrolled in private plans stay long enough with any firm to acquire vested pension rights.

Pension-plan supporters cite a study made by the actuarial firm of A. S. Hansen. In an examination of 864 firms, Hansen found two-thirds of covered employees will wind up with vested pension benefits.

For the covered who collect, private-pension-plan benefits alone won't guarantee a comfortable living standard. According to pension-industry sources, the average annual benefit paid by private plans to retirees is \$1,605.

According to the Labor Department, a retired couple in Boston living on a low budget needs \$3,645 a year.

Most employees do not contribute directly to benefits they receive on retirement. Some 75 percent of all private pension plans are

wholly financed by employers, according to Life Insurance Institute figures. In only 1 percent of private plans are benefits supported exclusively by worker contributions.

Businesses that fall can't support pension plans. So their plans usually terminate. Internal Revenue Service statistics show that one out of every 14 plants the IRS qualifies for tax exempt status eventually terminates.

First of a four part series. Next: the private pension system's vast pool of riches. Why are they needed and who regulates them?

## PENSION PLAN CHECKLIST—I

Questions you should be able to answer about your employer's pension plan:

1. How many years of continuous service are required to collect benefits?
2. What constitutes a break in service?
3. Can a pension be collected by a former employee who at retirement is working for another firm?
4. What is the minimum retirement age?
5. How much are benefits reduced for early retirement?
6. What formula is used to determine retirement benefits?
7. Is there a survivor option, providing reduced benefits to a pensioner's spouse?

## BLOWING THE WHISTLE ON SOVIET SPORTS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this evening, the Soviet national basketball team will conclude a tour of the United States. The tour has received very favorable coverage in the sports pages, although competing for space with the professional hockey and basketball playoffs and the developing baseball season.

It has long been my contention that the United States should thoroughly expose the professionalism which exists in Soviet sports and operations. By any legitimate standards, the Soviet Olympic participants should not be considered amateurs.

A recent article in the International Herald Tribune of Monday, April 23, came to my attention. In view of its significance and timeliness, I insert it into the Record at this point:

BLOWING THE WHISTLE ON SOVIET SPORTS  
(By Dr. J. Nelson Washburn)

New York, April 22.—Whatever the outcome of the series to be played by the visiting Soviet Olympic champion national basketball team and a group of American players, including some participants from the disputed game at Munich, there should be some unfinished business on the agenda of the United States Olympic Committee board of directors at the meeting here next Friday and Saturday.

Although the former president, Clifford H. Buck, was unsuccessful in his formal protest to reverse the result of the 51-50 game at Munich, the new president, Philip O. Krumm, is not precluded from undertaking another avenue to salvage the Olympic basketball gold medal for Americans.

The USOC board of directors has long considered amateurism in terms of Olympic eligibility. The report on "Amateurism in The United States," presented to the board March 6, 1972, ran 11 pages.

Unfortunately, neither that report nor its

sequel, submitted to the board July 7, 1972, contained a single word about amateur standing with respect to Olympic eligibility on behalf of Soviet athletes, including basketball players.

## MISSING VERSE

Efforts to make Soviet Olympic basketball players disgorge their gold medals have been virtually ruined by backsliding exhibited by the International Olympic Committee more than two years ago. On March 14, 1971, the IOC executive board approved unanimously Rule 26 on eligibility in a watered-down form, minus the one strongly worded paragraph it had contained that ruled ineligible for Olympic competition:

"Those who have capitalized in any way on their athletic fame or success, profited commercially therefrom or have accepted special inducements of any kind to participate, or those who have secured employment or promotion by reason of their sport performances rather than their ability, whether in commercial or industrial enterprises, the Armed Services or any branches of the Press, Theatre, Television, Cinema, Radio, or any other paid activity."

In this connection, the report in Krasnaya Zvezda, central organ of the Soviet Ministry of Defense, of the Moscow reception hosted by Minister of Defense Marshal Andrei Grechko last Oct. 10 is apropos. Honored guests were Soviet Olympians who were athletes of the armed forces. Marshal Grechko promoted 11 of these armed forces athletes "dosrochno," i.e. ahead of schedule. Two captains became majors; four senior lieutenants became captains; two junior lieutenants became lieutenants; two ensigns and a junior sergeant became junior lieutenants.

One of those promoted to lieutenant was Ivan Edeshko, whose court-length pass in the disputed final three seconds set up the winning basket by Aleksandr Belov at Munich.

Although the IOC chose to extract the one tooth in Rule 26 on eligibility that applied to both 1972 Winter and Summer Olympics, the language of Rule 26 that remained was restrictive even if essentially toothless. That language, printed in the "Participant's Declaration" signed by each and every participant in the Summer Olympics at Munich, stated:

"... For national aggrandizement, governments occasionally adopt the same methods and give athletes positions in the Army, on the police force or in a government office.... Recipients of these special favors which are granted only because of athletic ability are not eligible to compete in the Olympic Games."

## BIG FAVORS

It will be difficult—but not impossible—to attribute to basketball skill a Soviet Army career for Ivan Edeshko. The same goes for Sergei Belov, who contributed 20 points in the 51-50 victory over the Americans. He also was promoted last Oct. 10 from junior lieutenant to lieutenant.

Nevertheless, Rule 26 still makes any national Olympic committee or national federation knowing of fraudulent "special favors" for individual members of its Olympic team responsible for such mischief, if proved. The rule also places the basketball team in jeopardy of disqualification and forfeiture of games won with its mischief-makers. On such substantial legal ground, the USOC might still cast its traditional caution to the winds and undertake a legalistic protest.

In so doing, it could, with advantage, cite the unequivocal provision in the Act of Congress that incorporated the USOC Sept. 21, 1950, the stated objective of seeking "to maintain the highest ideals of amateurism... particularly in connection with the Olympic Games...."



The Krasnaya Zvezda account of the 11 promotions proudly declared that representatives of the armed forces of the U.S.S.R. had won 34 gold, 20 silver and 19 bronze medals of 107 gold, 46 silver and 50 bronze medals taken home from Munich by Soviet Olympians. About a dozen members of the United States armed forces competed in the Olympics but their programs were loosely organized.

Some observers believe that militarization of Olympic competition as practiced by the Soviet Union under Marshal Grechko has reached the point of becoming a mass phenomenon detrimental to the Olympic ethic. It may be appropriate, with both Ivan Edeshko and Sergei Belov on American soil, for the USOC to blow the whistle on militarization of the Olympic movement and try to salvage the 1972 Olympic basketball title in the process.

#### RABBI COHEN'S BELIEF: PARTNERS WITH GOD

#### HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 8, 1973, Rabbi Morris A. Cohen offered the opening prayer for the session of the House on that day. Since then he has continued to share with others his stimulating philosophy. The April 1, 1973, issue of the Buffalo Courier Express has an interesting article on the rabbi's current activities which I call to the attention of my colleagues and include at this point:

WNY's GOOD LISTENER—RABBI'S BELIEF: PARTNERS WITH GOD

(By H. Katherine Smith)

Dr. Morris A. Cohen who is, Buffalo's only Orthodox Jewish rabbi, delivered the prayer at the opening of the House of Representatives on March 8. In the invocation, he prayed:

"That we may enjoy the realization of thy Divine command which summons us to manifest our partnership with the God of creation and justice".

The idea of people being partners with God in the creation of modern society and daily living is basic to Rabbi Cohen's philosophy. He deems working with God for the good of humanity and the world far more important than praising God.

Rabbi Cohen considers himself "the unsalaried rabbi of Buffalo." Seven generations of his forebears were unsalaried rabbis. Four of his brothers are rabbis, two of them army chaplains.

Rabbi Cohen deems it a privilege to share with others his theological learning and his philosophy. Also, he believes that a religious leader's utterances may be limited if his congregation controls his purse. He is a psychologist in the Buffalo Public School System. He is one of a very few American rabbis to possess the degrees of doctor of ritual law and doctor of Jewish jurisprudence.

In the opinion of this clergyman, one of the most serious defects of our society is the prevalent refusal to assume responsibility. In the West Side schools where he works, he sees children arrive on a snowy day with sneakers on their feet—no rubbers or boots. Many tell him they have had no breakfast.

"Those neglected children's parents refuse to assume responsibility for them," he stated.

He says modern Americans instead of making their own decisions, try to have their

problems solved by professionals—the social worker, the counselor, or the psychiatrist. When a child is failing in school, I do not immediately suspect a mental or emotional disability. In many cases, the cause is an inadequate home environment, poverty, or substandard physical health.

"In our society," he told your Good Listener, "we are led to believe, from childhood, that we are entitled to live in a continuous state of happiness."

When adults feel depressed, they take tranquilizer or stimulant pills.

"Children, seeing their parents taking pills frequently, regard dope, when it is offered, as merely another type of pill. The young person who is not doing well in school and is not popular with his classmates seeks a shortcut to happiness through dope."

As psychological counselor of Hillel on both the UB and Buffalo State College campuses, Rabbi Cohen has known a number of couples who entered upon mixed marriages, that is marriages in which the partners are of different races or religions. He is opposed to any mixed marriage, and states that among them, the divorce rate is abnormally high.

"Partners of a racially mixed marriage are interacting with fantasy," he maintains. "They may be trying to prove they are less biased than others, or they may have chosen a partner of a different race to defy or distress their parents."

"Children of a racially mixed marriage find difficulty in identifying with either race. Children of parents reared in different religions are baffled by the different traditions of their grandparents."

It is the rabbi's conviction that the goal of education ought to be preparation for survival in modern society. He thinks many young persons who have grown up in the inner city are better prepared for this than those men and women with Ph.D. degrees who are unable to obtain employment in the fields for which they were educated.

The rabbi regrets that the majority of undergraduates in our schools and colleges are satisfied with merely "getting by," thereby missing the joy of doing the task at hand as well as they are able to do it.

While an undergraduate student at Yeshiva University, Morris Cohen's writings were quoted in books authored by outstanding rabbis. He obtained his master of science degree in psychology from that university, and interned as a clinical psychologist in two hospitals in New York City. For six years, he was a psychologist in New York City public schools, and for an equal period, he has been identified with the Buffalo schools.

Rabbi Cohen's wife is a Costa Rican, a teacher of Spanish literature at Canisius College. The couple has made five trips to Costa Rica and five trips to Israel.

They have an 8-year-old son, Raphael Ben Zion and two daughters, Tamar Nechama, 6, and Ayelet Hashahar, 4.

In every room of the family home at 380 Colvin Ave. are books, so readily accessible, that the intellectually curious need only stretch out a hand to reach a provocative volume.

Although he likes the idea of starting each day with prayer, he deems prayer in public schools "contrary to the U.S. Constitution as I understand it. It bans forced worship."

The Orthodox rabbi is writing a book on the psychology of the Gospels.

His affiliations include the American and New York State psychological associations, the State Assn. of School Psychologists, the Rabbinical Alliance of America, the Buffalo Board of Rabbis, Buffalo Teacher's Federation, the Political Action Committee, the Jewish Center, and the Montefiore Club of which he is an honorary member.

#### AND NOW THE CIA AND THE MARINE CORPS

#### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, like many Americans, I take no personal pleasure in the daily revelations in the press of the continuing chain of events in the Watergate scandal.

These revelations have now involved to greater and lesser degrees high officials in the White House, the Department of Justice, the FBI, the Department of Commerce, the State Department, the Department of Defense, and now the CIA and the U.S. Marine Corps.

Top aides at the White House have resigned—two Attorneys General have resigned—an acting FBI Director has resigned—a number of other lesser officials have resigned, while others have been convicted by the court and one imprisoned.

The disclosures seemingly go on and on, threatening to engulf the entire Government—and as these revelations continue, the faith of the American people in the Federal Government is being shaken as they read of the Watergate cancer spreading insidiously from one agency to another, touching more and more officials throughout the Government.

The recent revelations involve both the CIA and the U.S. Marine Corps, and in this connection I place in the RECORD herewith an editorial from the Washington Evening Star & News and other articles reporting the latest revelations concerning the CIA and the Marine Corps.

These articles follow:

CUSHMAN OKAYED CIA AID TO HUNT

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

Gen. Robert E. Cushman Jr., the Marine Corps commandant who in 1971 was deputy director of the Central Intelligence Agency, authorized the use of CIA material and research in the burglary of the office of Dr. Daniel Ellsberg's former psychiatrist, sources close to the Watergate case say.

The sources said yesterday that the general, who is now a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, acted at the request of John D. Ehrlichman, President Nixon's chief adviser for domestic affairs until he resigned last week.

Cushman, who left the CIA in 1971, was questioned by FBI agents late last week, the sources said, and reportedly accepted full responsibility for the decision to permit the CIA to help E. Howard Hunt Jr. and G. Gordon Liddy prepare for the break-in.

Cushman could not be reached for comment.

The federal prosecuting team in the Watergate case first learned of the burglary at the office of Dr. Lewis Fielding in an interview last month with John W. Dean III, who resigned as counsel to the President last week. Then, in grand jury testimony Wednesday, Hunt told of utilizing CIA disguises, fake identification papers, and even a "safehouse" in the Washington area that were provided by the agency's clandestine services, the so-called "dirty tricks" department.

Hunt, a 20-year CIA veteran who, along

with Liddy and five others, were arrested last year in connection with the Watergate bugging, also told the grand jury that he believed that cooperation with the CIA had been arranged by one of his superiors, Egil Krogh Jr.

At the time, according to grand jury testimony, Krogh, deputy to Ehrlichman, was directly in charge of a special White House team that had been set up in the aftermath of the June 1971 publication of the Pentagon Papers to determine who was involved in the disclosure of the documents.

Krogh, who reportedly has resigned his new job as under secretary of Transportation, has sent a classified affidavit to the Ellsberg trial court Friday in which he reportedly accepted full responsibility for the burglary.

Two sources confirmed yesterday, however, that Krogh did not have the authority to deal directly with the CIA on such matters as arranging help for a clandestine operation inside the United States.

One source knowledgeable about the Hunt-Liddy burglary plan gave the following version of how the agency's cooperation was enlisted:

The CIA connection was initiated by Hunt, who had instant telephone communication with that agency and other intelligence offices through a highly secure scrambler telephone that he and Liddy ordered installed in their quarters in the Executive Office Building, next to the White House.

After being told by a CIA official that further authority was needed before the agency could provide any assistance, the source said, Hunt went to Krogh, who took the problem to his superior, Ehrlichman.

Then the source went on:

"Ehrlichman makes a telephone call to Cushman, and says, 'Hey, these guys need some chores done. Won't you take care of it?' Cushman says, 'OK I'll do it.'"

"There was absolutely nothing in writing," the source said. "There was only one call—just a little lean-on call by Ehrlichman. And then Hunt and Liddy began asking for safe-houses and all the rest."

At the time of Ehrlichman's alleged call, all the key intelligence agencies of the government were said to be cooperating with the Hunt-Liddy group.

[From the Evening Star and News, May 8, 1973]

#### THE CIA AND ELLSBERG

On and on come the ugly revelations, the almost daily disclosures of how this nation's political and judicial processes have been manipulated and corrupted. Now we learn that the Central Intelligence Agency shares heavily in the responsibility for the Ellsberg case, which if not directly related to Watergate nevertheless helped set the stage for it and is indisputably part of the same poisonous syndrome.

Start with the premise that, for its own purposes, the CIA had no interest in digging up damaging information on Daniel Ellsberg and his role in leaking the Pentagon papers in June, 1971. But the White House surely did. And someone at the White House, possibly John Ehrlichman, induced someone high at CIA, probably General Robert E. Cushman, to authorize the use of the agency's clandestine services in the burglary of the office of Ellsberg's psychiatrist. That happened in September, 1971, while Richard Helms was still head of CIA and two months before General Cushman left his post as deputy director of the agency to become commandant of the Marine Corps. Meanwhile, and just as disturbing, the head of CIA's psychological assessment unit was directed (by whom?) to cooperate with the White

House in working up a psychological profile of Ellsberg.

At this point, the CIA-Ellsberg episode is subject to any number of interpretations. Loose threads and unanswered questions are everywhere. Yet even an interpretation most favorable to the agency leads to conclusions that are devastating.

The CIA, in brief, has been used and compromised and discredited in somewhat the same way that the FBI, under Patrick Gray, was used and compromised and discredited in the Watergate investigation. Perhaps it was the guiltier of the two. For the CIA lent its offices to the perpetration of a shoddy crime, to the trampling of civil liberties and to a domestic surveillance operation that by law it had no business conducting even indirectly.

It is difficult to believe that Helms, a canny and professional man, would have known all this beforehand and consented to such an improbable venture as the Hunt-Liddy burglary of the psychiatrist's office. Of course, anything is possible, as the nation has learned with relentless regularity the last few weeks.

General Cushman, even if his implication in the affair can be partially explained as unthinking, has a great deal to answer for. He is, to be sure, a distinguished military officer. He is also a longtime friend and supporter of the President's. Those two things need not have been incompatible. But in this case, apparently, they were. In the anything-goes pattern of Watergate, an otherwise decent man appears to have blocked off conscience and good judgment, and gone along with whatever the White House requested.

At first the Watergate scandal was said to be the work of a few ideological zealots. Later, it has been fashionable to lay the blame on men close to the President with a super-loyal, ad-agency turn of mind. But the web of Watergate-Ellsberg spreads much farther than that. In the FBI, in Justice, now in the CIA, it involves men and vital institutions the American public should have had every reason to trust, but now do not. Aside from the diminished stature of the presidency itself, that is what is hardest to take.

#### A NEW BAY OF PIGS FOR CIA?

(By Smith Hempstone)

It is now clear that the Central Intelligence Agency has been far more deeply implicated in the Watergate-Pentagon Papers scandal than had previously been suspected.

Earlier this week, the New York Times, quoting "sources close to the Watergate case," said that Gen. Robert E. Cushman Jr., the agency's former deputy director and now commandant of the Marine Corps, authorized CIA assistance in the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist. The Times said Cushman, who is out of the country and has not commented publicly on the allegation, acted at the request of former presidential counselor John D. Ehrlichman.

An indirect CIA connection with the Watergate Seven had been evident from the beginning of the affair last June. G. Gordon Liddy, the former White House consultant and operational chief of the bugging of Democratic national committee headquarters, had been an agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. E. Howard Hunt Jr., his deputy, had been the CIA agent who planned the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion.

James W. McCord had served 19 years in the CIA until his "retirement" in 1970; he became security chief of the Nixon campaign committee in 1972. Cuban-born Bernard L. Barker worked with Hunt on the Bay of Pigs invasion, acting as a link between the CIA and the army of exiled Cubans.

Frank Sturgis (alias Frank Fiorini) also was involved in the Bay of Pigs and has CIA connections. The two Cuban members of the raiding party, Eugenio R. Martinez and Virgilio R. Gonzalez, also had records of anti-Castro activity.

But the emphasis always was on a past CIA association. It was easy to believe this: Washington and Miami are full of former intelligence agents willing to undertake contract work which their colleagues within the CIA would be forbidden by law to engage in (under the National Security Act of 1947, which created the agency, CIA's activities are restricted to work abroad).

It now appears possible, even probably, that Liddy, Hunt and possibly others of the Watergate Seven had not in fact severed their relations with the intelligence community and were, indeed, operating with the knowledge and consent of the CIA.

These seemingly isolated but possibly interrelated events point to a pattern of CIA involvement:

Hunt was hired by the Robert R. Mullen & Co. public relations firm in 1970 on the personal recommendation of the then CIA Director, Richard Helms. It is still unclear as to whose payroll Hunt was on after he joined the White House staff in the summer of 1971.

In December of last year when Watergate was just beginning to heat up, Helms was fired as CIA chief and shipped off to Tehran as ambassador to Iran.

Helms' successor, James R. Schlesinger, who came to CIA from the Office of Management and Budget via the Atomic Energy Commission, has been conducting a widespread purge of the agency.

Hunt testified last week to the Watergate grand jury (according to a transcript released by attorneys for Pentagon Papers defendants Daniel Ellsberg and Anthony Russo) that the CIA provided him and Liddy with cameras, disguises, false identity papers and other "technical assistance" for the burglary of the Beverly Hills office of Dr. Lewis Fielding, Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

Hunt told of meetings with CIA agents in two of the agency's "safe houses"—secret hideaways—in this city. He also told of being given a CIA "sterile" telephone number—an unlisted number in which billings are not reflected—to call when in need of "material" assistance.

Hunt's grand jury testimony can be given a great deal of credence because in it he correctly identified Dr. Bernard Melloy as the head of the CIA's psychiatric unit. Dr. Melloy's identity previously had been a closely held secret. He is not listed in the Washington, Maryland or Virginia telephone directories, but he maintains a private office at 2520 Pennsylvania Ave., in addition to his CIA office in McLean, Va. Hunt also revealed, correctly, that Melloy's unit works up psychiatric profiles in persons "of interest" to the U.S. government. Ellsberg was the subject of one of these profiles; similar studies have been made of Fidel Castro and Leonid Brezhnev.

Although Helms was appointed head of the CIA by Lyndon Johnson in 1966. President Nixon has close personal links with the present deputy director of the CIA, Maj. Gen. Vernon A. Walters, as he had with Walters' predecessor, Gen. Cushman, the Marine Corps commandant.

Gen. Cushman was Nixon's naval aide during the former's vice presidential years. Gen. Walters was President Eisenhower's personal interpreter and accompanied Nixon on his disastrous 1958 tour of Latin America.

In short, it looks as if CIA may have been into the Watergate-Ellsberg mess up to its clandestine ears.



## WELFARE SCANDAL—XVII

## HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Congress is finally showing some signs of recognizing the importance of controlling Federal spending. But even if we control total spending, there is a long way to go in improving the productivity of our Government programs. Foremost among the offenders as wasteful, fraud-ridden, and ineffective is our system of providing public welfare.

Clearly, both administrators and recipients contribute to the failure of our welfare system. But is the organization of our delivery system of welfare assistance which abets and encourages the waste and inefficiency. Things just must be tightened up. Greater controls must be imposed.

I am inserting into the RECORD today the 17th installment of an investigative series run recently by the Milwaukee Sentinel exposing the fantastic waste in the Milwaukee County Welfare Department. Today's installment illustrates how ineligible recipients take advantage of poor administrative controls and apply successfully for aid for which they do not qualify under the law. I hope this example spurs greater congressional awareness of the urgency for reform of our welfare system.

## WOMAN RUNS TAVERN, RECEIVES AID

(By Gene Cunningham and Stuart Wilk)

A woman is receiving welfare grants under one name and operating a Milwaukee tavern and restaurant under another name.

The woman is listed as president, treasurer and agent of Inn Old Milwaukee, 101 S. Dana Ct., under the name Patricia Utecht, according to city tavern license records.

Her home address is listed as that of the tavern.

The same woman is receiving welfare grants under the name Mrs. Patricia Mitsch, 8740 S. Oak Park Dr., Oak Creek, according to Milwaukee County Welfare Department records.

Welfare records show that Patricia Mitsch's maiden name was Patricia Utecht.

Reached for comment Thursday, the woman first responded that she was "Pat" when a reporter asked for Patricia Utecht, then said she was Patricia Mitsch and did not know Patricia Utecht.

She said she lived in Oak Creek and was receiving welfare assistance.

The agent for a corporation operating a tavern in the city of Milwaukee must live in the city, according to a city licensing regulation.

Both the tavern license records and welfare records show that the woman was born on June 23, 1936.

The license application, signed by Patricia Utecht, states that no women are to be employed in the operation of the tavern, although the woman who said she is Patricia Mitsch, not Patricia Utecht, said she works there doing cleaning free of charge.

In the application, Patricia Utecht also said that she had lived for two years at 2448 N. Fratney St. prior to moving to the tavern address.

One of the former owners of that property, Mrs. Walter Bohrer, of Big Bend, confirmed Thursday that she and her husband

rented to a woman Mrs. Bohrer identified as Mrs. Pat Mitsch.

Mrs. Bohrer said they rented half of a duplex they owned at the Fratney address but she could not remember for how long. She said the woman she knew as Mrs. Mitsch moved out sometime last year.

The Bohrers sold the property last November.

"I didn't know anybody by that name," Mrs. Bohrer said when queried about renting to Patricia Utecht.

The corporation headed by Patricia Utecht pays \$625 a month rent for the tavern, according to records.

Records further show that the corporation paid \$1,000 for stock for the tavern, \$7,000 for fixtures and \$7,000 for "good will of the business" when the corporation took over the tavern operations last year.

The woman is receiving assistance under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). Her March grant was \$145 plus a \$146 voucher payment to Oak Park, Inc., 8720 S. Oak Park Dr., Oak Creek. The payment was for rent, according to records.

The woman's April grant will be \$87 plus the \$146 rent payment, according to records.

She also is getting food stamps, welfare records show.

The woman's AFDC case was opened Dec. 1, 1971. The grant includes the woman and two children.

A spokesman for Oak Park Apartments confirmed that Mrs. Patricia Mitsch rents an apartment there.

"I don't know where she works," the spokesman said. "I don't even know if she works."

Val Luljack, who rents the tavern building to Inn Old Milwaukee, Inc., told the Sentinel that Patricia Utecht tends bar at the tavern but does not live in either of the apartments above the tavern and restaurant.

He said he had been told that she lives in a South Side suburb with her children.

The following is a telephone interview with the woman in a call to the Inn Old Milwaukee.

Q. Patricia Utecht, please.

A. This is Pat.

Q. Pat, are you perhaps the one who lives down in Oak Creek—Patricia Mitsch?

A. Yes.

Q. Fine. This is . . . a reporter at The Milwaukee Sentinel. . . We've run across some welfare records showing that you are receiving welfare payments for yourself and your children.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. Is this correct?

A. Yes it is.

Q. But do you live in Oak Creek?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you run the tavern?

A. No, my boyfriend does.

Q. But you are involved in the corporation there?

A. No.

Q. You're not involved?

A. No.

[Records show that Patricia Utecht is president, treasurer and agent of the corporation that operates the tavern.]

Q. What are you, just a bartender there?

A. No, I just come in and clean and stuff when he's not here.

Q. So you feel you really are eligible for welfare then?

A. I have no other income?

Q. You have no other income?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. In other words you work there free of charge?

A. Well, his mother helps my children with clothes and things.

Q. What we're trying to determine is outside income and eligibility for welfare. . . . But the welfare is your only source of income?

A. That's my only source. . . . I know I want to go back to school but I don't drive and don't have a car. I'd have to be taken back and forth.

Q. Are you aware that your name is on the license for the tavern as president, treasurer and agent—for which you should be living in the city of Milwaukee?

A. Pat who? Mitsch?

Q. Utecht.

A. No. The Utecht girl. No this isn't. This is Pat Mitsch. There is a Pat Utecht, too.

Q. You said you were Pat Utecht.

A. No, Pat Mitsch.

Q. You are Pat Mitsch?

A. Yes.

Q. Well, then, is there at Pat Utecht there?

A. No. I don't even hardly know her. It's uh, part of the family.

Q. You were both born on the same date though.

A. I don't really know.

Q. So you are not Pat Utecht?

A. No, I'm Pat Mitsch.

Q. Was your maiden name Utecht?

A. No.

Q. It wasn't?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. But you are Pat Mitsch?

A. Yes.

[Welfare records show that Patricia Mitsch's maiden name is Patricia Utecht.]

Q. Your husband's name was Donald Mitsch?

A. No.

A. No. I don't know where you got this from.

[Welfare records show that Mrs. Mitsch's husband's name was Donald. A man who identified himself as Mrs. Mitsch's son at the Mitsch apartment said that his father's name is Donald.]

[License records show that Patricia Utecht is divorced.]

Q. Do you happen to know Pat Utecht?

A. No. I know there's an agent here, you know. Because it's a corporation.

Q. But you are not Pat Utecht?

A. No. It kinda shocked me now.

Q. When you answered the phone I asked for Pat Utecht and you said you were Pat Utecht.

A. I heard you say Patty, you know.

Q. How do I get in touch with Pat Utecht?

A. The only thing I can think of is (pause).

Oh Christ—I don't know if Mother and Dad would know.

Q. I would like very much to call her and talk to her if you could give me a phone number or—

A. I have no phone number because I really don't even know her.

Q. You don't even know her?

A. No.

Q. She doesn't work at the tavern then?

A. No, uh-huh.

Q. Do you perhaps tend bar at the tavern, too, as well as cleaning?

A. No, uh-huh.

Q. So there's no Pat Utecht that works at the tavern?

A. No, uh-huh.

[Luljack said that Patricia Utecht tends bar at the tavern]

Q. You're sure you're not Pat Utecht?

A. No, uh-huh. If I was I'd tell you.

Q. When's your birthday . . . ?

A. My birthday is June 23.

Q. 1936?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And you're sure you're not the same person?

A. No.

## TRIBUTE TO A DEDICATED OFFICER

## HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 years, one of the most able Army officers I have known, Col. Richard L.

Fischer, Special Assistant to Jack Marsh, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, has worked with me, other members of the committee and the committee staff. Since he has been selected to attend the Army War College, he will be leaving the Pentagon shortly.

Colonel Fischer's tenure in legislative affairs has been characterized by a complete dedication to duty and a refreshing attitude of cooperation toward the Congress. I have never known Colonel Fischer to be anything but forthright and courteous in his liaison work with the Hill. His presence in the Pentagon has made the Armed Services Committee work much easier.

It is with deep regret that I see this truly outstanding officer leave legislative affairs, but I am delighted that the Army has also recognized his potential and is sending him to Carlisle. It bodes well for our country when men of his ability are selected for advancement.

I know that all of my colleagues will join me in wishing Colonel Fischer and his family the very best in the years ahead.

#### ISRAEL'S 25TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, all citizens of the world who love freedom join in congratulating the State of Israel on its 25th anniversary.

No people in history have been so persecuted or so long denied a permanent homeland. But with strength and conviction many times greater than the inhumanity and injustice encountered, the Jewish people have survived with honor and dignity. And all of us are strengthened by their example of courage, fortitude, and love of freedom.

In celebrating the 25th anniversary of the State of Israel, we acknowledge a human miracle—a land brought to life by faith, hard work, and a relentless drive for personal and cultural freedom. That such a richly diverse and creative community could emerge from a people who have suffered centuries of harassment and deprivation is, indeed, remarkable.

Yet, despite the incredible progress Israel has made in its short lifetime, it still faces enormous and continuing problems. With defense requirements absorbing 30 percent of its national budget and debt service another 20 percent, available funding for domestic needs is clearly inadequate. The growing influx of Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union creates the need for even more human services.

These are great challenges for a young nation, and I wish Israel the very best as it acts to secure its future and create a nation where all its people are afforded the maximum chance for personal development and fulfillment.

With such a deep bond of common ideals and human values, the United States and Israel will always find their respective fates intertwined. We, to-

gether, can do much to help each other and to advance our shared ideals of brotherhood, human dignity, and cultural freedom. It is in this spirit that I again congratulate Israel on its 25th anniversary and stand with the Jewish people as we look with faith and determination to the next 25 years of the State of Israel.

#### SAN CARLOS INDIAN TRIBE PLACED IN AN UNFORTUNATE DILEMMA

### HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, an old controversy in Arizona involving the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe, several ranching families, and the Department of the Interior is proceeding to final settlement. Unless Congress takes affirmative action, however, the settlement cannot be said to be acceptable or just. I am speaking about a controversy surrounding over 200,000 acres in Arizona known as the San Carlos Mineral Strip and a long history of Government mistakes which have placed the San Carlos Indian Tribe as well as a group of ranchers in an unfortunate dilemma. While both the Indians and the ranchers have acted in good faith, the Government made some mistakes many years ago and it is time for the Government to provide a remedy.

The dilemma we face today has its roots in actions taken during the last century. Briefly, the history goes like this: The area now known as the San Carlos Mineral Strip was originally a portion of the San Carlos Indian Reservation established in the 1870's. Believing the land to be suitable for mineral development pursuant to congressional authorization, the area in question, which comprised over 230,000 acres, was ceded to the United States in 1896 to be held in trust by the Government with net proceeds resulting from disposal thereof to be paid to the Indians.

The belief that the Indians would profit from the transaction was apparently ill-founded as 35 years later the net revenue totaled only \$12,433 and the lands were withdrawn from mineral entry or disposition. Instead of restoring the area to the tribe, however, a number of actions by the Secretary of the Interior resulted in the lands being opened for grazing and permits were issued. During this period, the present occupants of Mineral Strip, or their predecessors, undertook the back-breaking job of ranching and it is these individuals who now stand to lose the benefits of their lives' work.

Obviously, the tribe was not satisfied with the situation, and the tribal government continued to press for restoration. After a couple of false starts and a short-lived lawsuit, the Secretary of the Interior recognized the validity of the tribe's claim and January 16, 1969, the lands were restored to the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

The tribe has decided that the land is now needed for its own people and has ordered that the 20 or so non-Indian ranchers vacate the premises by June 30 of this year. If they are to comply with this order, the ranchers will walk away from their homes, barns, corrals, and other ranching improvements that represent the bounty of years of plain hard work.

The story is obviously more complicated than indicated in this brief outline and I am sure that those familiar with the controversy can point to many specific occurrences to reinforce the notion that the Government's actions were often misconceived and substantial rights, on both sides, were frequently ignored. Without belittling the value of the lessons we can learn by focusing on the unfortunate history of the situation, I think we should point out that such discourse is, indeed, history and the relevant question is what we can do about it now?

It has long been apparent to me that both the Indians and the ranchers have significant rights in the area. Thus, should the question of superior rights to the land be resolved in favor of one side, the other side is entitled to compensation. The basic issue now having been resolved in favor of the San Carlos Tribe, it becomes incumbent on Congress to follow through and authorize payment to the ranchers for their losses. My colleagues, SAM STEIGER and JOHN CONLAN, have taken that step and introduced a compensation bill. Today, I join them and indicate my full support for this measure by introducing my bill to provide relief in terms of dollars, although I recognize that money alone cannot fully compensate a man who is forced to abandon a way of life built by his own sweat and determination.

Over the period of my involvement with this controversy and especially during the last few months, I have searched for solutions which would make it possible to protect the ranchers' way of life and still grant appropriate recognition of the tribe's right to these lands. A fully adequate solution is, apparently, not to be found, so we are left with compensation which is certainly a justified, if minimal, remedy.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be able to take early action on this bill and I am pleased that the chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee, JOHN MELCHER, has scheduled hearings on this matter later this week. Compared to the major legislation now pending before that committee, I suppose that the importance of this legislation may not be readily apparent. Although, it is true that the number of the affected individuals is small, I would suggest that the principle involved is enormous, as it touches on the ability of the Government to deal fairly with its people and to remedy its mistakes.

A lawyer who represented mineral strip ranchers once wrote me that his clients were "skeptical of the possibility of securing an appropriation for the relief of a handful of Western ranchers," and in the nature of these matters this kind of pragmatism is probably warranted. I am



hopeful, however, that the old injustices will not be left merely partially corrected with only the San Carlos Tribe receiving relief, but that the Congress will act to insure that this other group of affected citizens, this "handful of Western ranchers," also receive equitable treatment through enactment of legislation to fully compensate them for their losses.

#### NOTHING WRONG WITH PENNIES FOR THE PLAYERS

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, with our enormous gross national product, the Kansas City Star points out, we can afford a modest assist for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. An editorial in behalf of such support which appeared in the Star of April 30 follows:

#### NOTHING WRONG WITH PENNIES FOR THE PLAYERS

The National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities are the first permanent incursion of the federal government into support for what can be described as cultural activities and institutions in the United States. Together, they form the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. Each Endowment has its staff and representative council of citizens appointed by the President.

President Johnson signed the bill establishing the National Foundation in 1965 and since then support from the Nixon administration and subsequent Congresses has been increasing. The current budgets for the two Endowments are \$38 million each. The authorization now before Congress is for \$80 million in 1974, \$140 million in 1975 and \$200 million in 1976. Now Sen. William Proxmire (D-Wis.) has offered an amendment to cut the authorizations sharply. He would put them at \$60 million in 1974, \$80 million in 1975 and \$100 million in 1976.

Having been pretty much ignored by the federal system for most of the last two centuries, the arts and the humanities in the United States no doubt could survive under the proposed Proxmire cuts. Nevertheless, we would hate to see it. For the first time ever this country has launched on a relatively modest course of nurturing and encouraging the structures and individuals that contribute to the cultural advancement of our civilization. To lose momentum now would necessarily be a setback. The state councils that have worked effectively with the national groups could be hurt—and some of the state organizations have rather tenuous existences.

Senator Proxmire is not certain that so much money could be used efficiently and he fears it will be used to produce second-rate art. He wonders about the danger of a government takeover.

Outside the educational institutions, the foundations and the occasional native Medici who come along from time to time, the artists and writers and musicians have had to depend on the fickle box office and not much else.

Most nations, including democratic nations have found themselves able to divert a small percentage of the national treasury

to the subsidy of the arts, humanities and sciences. God knows the United States has put enough money into the sciences over the last three decades. Surely there is no reason why a few piddling dollars cannot be used to relieve a potentially fine composer from the daily drudgery of instructing unwilling pupils in the piano or an artist teaching unhappy youngsters how to draw a pussy-cat. Not that these aren't worthy pursuits. But contrary to romantic belief, there is no real reason why artists, writers and musicians need to suffer endlessly in poverty in order to create. Some do better on a full stomach and in a warm room.

As for government production of second-rate art, Senator Proxmire hardly can be the judge of that, nor would we let congressional committees try to fulfill that role. Great art can only be judged in the perspective of time and what might be second-rate to a Wisconsin senator in 1973 might turn out to be something else a century from now. Nor can we really become alarmed by the senator's concern about the capture of the arts and humanities by government for purposes of propaganda.

Even if government should seize these cultural qualities for evil purposes, we doubt whether anyone would look at the pictures or go to the movies or read the books. Hitler tried mightily to pervert the arts and literature for his purposes, and the only effort that got attention was the spectacular nudes that antedated Playboy Magazine.

With its enormous gross national product, most of which goes to immediate consumer needs, and some of which goes to necessary governmental expenditures for the general welfare and defense, the U.S. can spare a pittance for the arts and humanities. Unless they prosper, what remains might not be worth very much. The proposal is not to buy or wholly subsidize culture, but merely to give it a modest assist which the country can afford to do and can't afford not to do at this stage of our history.

#### CONGRESSMAN DOMINICK V. DANIELS HAILS 500TH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF KOPERNIK AND 192D ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION OF 1791

### HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, this is a great month for Poles and Americans of Polish descent as we observe the 500th anniversary of the birth of Mikolaj Kopernik, whose name is often westernized to Copernicus, and the 192d anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Mr. Speaker, the liberties of the Constitution of 1791 were not long lasting as Poland was partitioned shortly after by powerful neighboring states. But the call to freedom in that Constitution rings loud and clear across the ages. Tyrants may have conquered Polish territory but they have never conquered the Polish soul nor the Polish desire for liberty and self-government. Even today while Polish destiny is controlled by Soviet masters the Polish soul remains unfettered and all of us know that Poland will yet enjoy the blessings of freedom.

Poles and Polish-descended persons in

this nation now number more than 10 million, and it can be said that no group of our fellow Americans has done more for this Nation than the sons and daughters of Poland. At this time I am proud to join with all Polonians everywhere in celebration of these two historic events.

#### LEE HAMILTON'S WASHINGTON REPORT OF MAY 9, 1973, ENTITLED "AFRICA"

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington Report of May 9, 1973, entitled "Africa":

#### AFRICA

As I traveled in Africa for the second time last week and talked with African leaders, I kept asking myself just what are the American interests in this vast continent, three times the size of the U.S. and with a population of 344 million people.

Few questions are asked a U.S. Congressman about Africa; comparatively few Americans travel in Africa; African issues seldom get much attention in the news media; and it would be a rare American indeed who could identify every country on a map of the African continent.

A glance at the statistics, though, quickly confirms that the U.S. has much more to do with Africa than most Americans might think. Even with declining worldwide aid resources, American assistance to 35 African countries grew to about \$550 million last year. 2,500 Peace Corps volunteers served in 25 countries and almost 10,000 Africans studied last year in American universities. Private American investment is growing at a rate of about 15 percent each year, and now totals about \$4 billion. American businessmen are seen in all corners of Africa, and our growing trade with African countries approaches \$3 billion each year. Or, to state it in simpler terms, every time we drink a cup of coffee, eat a chocolate bar or vanilla ice cream, we are touched by Africa.

American interests in Africa spring from the many Americans of African descent and the long involvement of American churchmen, educators, and businessmen with Africa. With one-third of the world's independent nations in Africa (41 nations), their voice has become increasingly important in world affairs. The overwhelming preoccupation of African leaders is the economic development of their countries, a goal which is entirely compatible with American interest in stability and economic growth. As African countries develop, American interests and opportunities expand.

Despite impressive progress in maintaining political independence and generating significant economic growth, Africa faces two awesome problems: (1) Modernization; The great dream for Africans is for the development of their rich continent which contains 96 percent of the world's diamonds, 42 percent of its cobalt, 60 percent of its gold, 23 percent of its uranium, and all of the 53 most important minerals, including vast energy resources; and (2) Full participation of its black majorities in South Africa in the political and economic life of the continent.

1972 was not an especially encouraging year for Africa. Development slackened, the black-white dialogue collapsed, Western style democracy faltered (not a single country in Africa practices it, and one-third of Africa's

344 million people are under military rule), the number of refugees grew, heavy dependence upon one commodity continued in most African countries, and the universal human problems of employment, health, nutrition and education remained intractable.

Africa's immense problems of overemphasis of industrialization, neglect of agriculture, the rural exodus and subsequent overcrowding of cities, and the lack of technical skills raise tremendous obstacles to development. But improvements are being made in health and education; a bright, sturdy, impatient younger generation is emerging; and, as a sharpened realism increases the emphasis on self-reliance, the African dream remains strong, even if distant.

U.S. policy seeks to broaden political, cultural and economic ties with Africa, and it is based on several basic elements:

1. *Opposition to racial discrimination:* The governments of South Africa and Rhodesia have established elaborate political systems of white supremacy over the black majorities (in South Africa there are 3.8 million whites and 17.5 million blacks). We cannot accept the racial policies of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia which violate our national ideals and constitute an affront to our sense of justice. Although we reject the use of force as a means to bring change, and cannot solve these problems ourselves, we urge the governments to change their racial policies to support equality of opportunity for all persons.

2. *Support of self-determination:* We support the right of self-determination for the people of Africa. We should not assist Portugal, e.g. in its efforts to deny self-determination in Portuguese Africa.

3. *Support of economic development:* Most African countries need assistance at this point in their development. We should concentrate our modest amounts of aid in the fields of agriculture, education, health, transportation and communications, and provide more of our assistance through international institutions. Private U.S. investment and trade should also be encouraged.

## THE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA SHOULD CEASE ABSENT CON- GRESSIONAL APPROVAL

**HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, I introduced the following bill which speaks for itself and which I think should be promptly enacted:

H.R. 7251

A bill to prohibit certain belligerent activities by United States personnel in Southeast Asia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful for any military or civilian personnel of the United States to engage in any military or paramilitary belligerent activity in Southeast Asia, or to cause any other military or civilian personnel of the United States to engage in any such activity, except to defend themselves in case of attack.

SEC. 2. The provisions of the first section of this Act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment but shall not apply with respect to any activity specifically authorized by an Act of Congress enacted on or after such date of enactment.

CXIX—952—Part 12

## PHASE III OF THE NEW ECONOMIC PROGRAM

**HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last week, the President took a small step back from phase III of the new economic program by announcing that corporations with sales over \$250 million whose overall prices rise more than 1.5 percent over the January 10 level must give 30 days notice to the Cost of Living Council. It does not bar such price increases. It does not go all the way back to phase II guidelines which made essentially the same public disclosure requirement of firms with sales over \$100 million. And it does not begin to implement proposals considered in the Congress to freeze all prices temporarily or to place automatic controls on sectors whose prices increase by 3 percent on an annual basis in any consecutive 2-month period. In short, the new policy falls far short of what is needed to begin to solve the grave inflationary problems we face.

Hobart Rowen wrote an article, "Nixon Fails To Strengthen Feeble Phase III," which appeared in the May 6 issue of the Washington Post and which took a close, critical look at the President's new policy. It is the best summary I have yet seen of the shortcomings of the Nixon actions and I would like to insert it in the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues:

NIXON FAILS TO STRENGTHEN FEEBLE  
PHASE III

(By Hobart Rowen)

So now we have not Phase IV, but merely Phase III plus one-eighth. After weeks of debate, President Nixon took a halting, limited, disappointing step to discourage some price boosts by the biggest companies.

It is a far cry from a freeze that would bar further price increases throughout the economy, or from a return to the tough prenotification requirements of Phase II, under which all companies with sales over \$100 million had to tell the government in advance of any plan to raise prices.

The new system announced Wednesday requires companies with sales over \$250 million whose overall weighted average price level rises to more than 1.5 per cent over the Jan. 10 level to give 30 days notice to the Cost of Living Council. But this doesn't bar individual price hikes of substantially more than that, provided the average stays within the 1.5 per cent margin.

As former Economic Council Chairman Arthur M. Okun observes, that's a "free ride" which works out to an annual rate of increase of about 5 per cent—hardly compatible with a program whose overall goal is to limit inflation to a 2.5 per cent rate by the end of the year.

Even as things stand, the tremendous surge in first-quarter profits makes one wonder whether half of the companies subject to regulations aren't violating the rules.

A Dow Jones survey of 655 companies (pretty well paralleling those new getting the 1.5 per cent free ride) shows corporate profits up 27.8 per cent in the first quarter compared with the first three months last year. And last year's profits after taxes were up 15.5 per cent over 1971.

The Nixon program is weak not only because it lacks specific, hard-nosed measures to control inflation, but because of the ob-

vious lack of enthusiasm for controls that is still pervasive in this administration.

It is still "as voluntary as it can be," the President said, adding: "and as mandatory as it has to be." The stress, as it has been before under the direction of free-market advocate George Shultz, is on "a responsible budget policy" to reduce inflationary pressures.

The dominant philosophy is to rely on the traditional dampening effects not only of a tight fiscal policy, but a restrictive monetary policy to reduce demand. There is a flurry of action of dubious significance to increase supplies both in food and non-food areas.

Controls are simply "the third element" in the anti-inflation program, a sort of fifth wheel, and clearly a distasteful exercise that is being tolerated because there is so much public and political backing for them.

It is this aura of contempt for the utility of wage and price controls that comes through the President's message and the additional comments of his key subordinates. "We should be mature enough to recognize that there is no instant remedy for this problem" (of sharp price increases), the President said in a patronizing way.

The fact is that the sharp price increases in February, March and April were triggered in part by the Jan. 11 lifting of Phase II controls. There is now a tendency to blame much of the rise in raw materials prices on the devaluation of the dollar in February. But it is not mentioned by Mr. Nixon that one of the elements triggering the devaluation was the loss of confidence in the dollar touched off by the shift to Phase III.

There is, of course, no "instant remedy" for inflation, but surely that doesn't mean the President is excused from constructing a carefully devised, long-range program that might have a chance for success.

The latest wholesale price index, for April, shows a jump of 1.3 per cent for industrial commodities, on top of a 1.2 per cent increase in March and 1.0 in February. That's an unbelievable 14 per cent annual rate of increase for the three months, which will begin to show up in the consumer price index later on.

New York economist Pierre Rinfret expresses a fairly common view among economists when he says that "the new program is a continuation of a do-nothing policy reminiscent of 1969. They are merely hoping or praying that something will come along and bail them out of their mistakes."

Former Economic Council member and Harvard Prof. Otto Eckstein told this correspondent that "what they've done is to make a symbolic gesture to keep the impression alive that they're still concerned about prices. We should be grateful that they have put some limit on the ability of industry to raise prices while profits are soaring, but compared to what they could have done, they've done very little."

At the Federal Reserve Board—which will have to pursue a tighter monetary policy than it believes desirable in the absence of a strong wage-price control effort, officials still think that Phase III (and one-eighth) can be made viable if Treasury Secretary Shultz and John Dunlop at the Cost of Living Council take a tough, rather than permissive, line.

My conclusion is that, given the kind of wage-price program President Nixon has chosen to follow, he should ask John Dunlop to step aside in favor of Billy Graham.

## OEO FAILS THE POOR

**HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, on March 28, 1973, an editorial appeared in



the Wheeling News-Register of Wheeling, W. Va.

This editorial points out the waste and scandal that have become too common in many of OEO's programs.

This editorial also points out without a doubt the necessity of restructuring OEO.

I include this editorial in the RECORD:  
OEO FAILS THE POOR

While we have disagreed with President Nixon on various matters both domestic and foreign, we support him in his efforts to do away with the wasteful, scandal-ridden Office of Economic Opportunity.

The much-trumpeted war on poverty of a few years back has been a miserable flop and even some of its staunchest supporters now are having a change of heart.

OEO has demonstrated again how well-intentioned but ill-conceived federal programs help the poor have led to corruption and demoralization. Investigation has shown that only a small fraction of anti-poverty funds ever managed to trickle down to the benefit of the poor people.

One phase of OEO's activity had to do with sponsoring Community Action Programs. Since 1964 the federal government has spent over \$2.8 billion for these efforts with few success stories reported. In fact, a whopping 80 per cent of all Community Action money has been spent on headquarters salaries and overhead expenses—only 20 per cent of the money, if even that, ever found its way to the poor.

Consider these various examples of OEO's waste and scandal turned up by investigators:

In Harlem, Montana, a local attorney who was the city attorney of another community received a \$20,000 salary as a "tourism specialist."

In Elizabeth, New Jersey, an employee rented a house to the Community Action project for \$383 a month. He was buying it for \$128 a month on a VA loan. A member of the CAA board of directors rented another house to Headstart for \$225 a month. He was paying \$55 a month to a realty firm for it.

In Las Vegas, Nevada, the CAA organization provided the organization for a partisan election race by the group's board chairman, and the executive director used staff members to work on his personal residence with materials he charged to the program.

In Fort Lauderdale, Florida, a community action employee and director were convicted of being part of an auto theft ring.

In Canton, Ohio, the project purchased lumber from a firm owned by a board director. One full-time staff member employed his daughter at \$300 a month.

In Oklahoma, a regional project purchased a \$39,500 building from the brother of one of the project lawyers. Six months earlier, the property had been appraised at \$15,200.

In Nassau, New York, all project employees who declined to participate in a "March on Washington" were fired.

In Jersey City, New Jersey, the project was captured by the Black Panther Party which used the organization's funds to spread hate literature and provide bail bonds for party members arrested on criminal charges, including the bombing of police precinct houses.

In Portland, Oregon, the CAA board chairman was convicted of firebombing, as the leader of an arson gang that fired at least seven major structures.

Indeed, the list could go on indefinitely but the point has been made—OEO's record is a scandal! The federal government, over the past decade, has sought to correct many inequities in American society through a vast range of programs involving massive expenditures of the taxpayer's money. The inequities

remain and we are paying the price for the failures. There must be a better way to help the truly poor and deserving needy. OEO is not the answer and President Nixon has no choice but to terminate it.

# CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY: REAL ISSUE IS UNITED STATES CON- TROL VERSUS U.S.S.R. DOMINA- TION

## HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the acquisition of the Canal Zone and the construction of the Panama Canal form one of the most glorious chapters of American history. Those who formulated our Isthmian canal policies in the early part of the 20th century included such leaders as Secretary of State Hay, Secretary of War Taft, Rear Adm. John G. Walker, and, above all, President Theodore Roosevelt. All of them were men who obtained facts, studied the subject, came to reasoned conclusions, and made their own decisions.

Today, conditions in our Government are different. Instead of our highest officials personally considering the vital canal policy matter they depend upon subordinates in the executive branch whose knowledge is usually superficial and whose views are governed by nebulous considerations of what they think is "policy."

An outstanding example of such inept conduct of U.S. Isthmian policy was brought to light as the result of a telegram sent by Lt. Gen. Pedro A. Del Valle, USMC, retired, on March 11, 1973, to the President in protest against the 15-21 March meeting of the U.N. Security Council in Panama in which he recommended a plan of action for the United States at its opening session.

Instead of the President acting upon that important message, it was referred for reply to the Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who apparently did not know the difference between a lieutenant and a lieutenant general. As might be expected, the reply to General Del Valle's message, in line with sophistical policy assumptions instead of reasoned guidance from the highest authority, was largely irrelevant, ambiguous, and even self-contradictory, ignoring the grim realities involved in the gravely important problems of maintaining, operating, sanitating and protecting the most strategic artery of marine transportation in the world.

The latest information from the Near East is that the new Government of Libya, which is in the Soviet orbit with Egypt, has promised a multi-million dollar loan to the revolutionary government of Panama. This development serves to reemphasize the fact that the real issue over the Canal Zone is not U.S. sovereignty versus Panamanian, but continued U.S. sovereign control versus U.S.S.R. domination; and this is the question that should be debated in the Congress.

In order that the Congress and responsible agencies in the Executive may be informed, I insert General Del Valle's telegram of March 11, the State Department's reply of March 26, and the former's letter to the President of April 17, as well as a news story on the projected Libyan loan to Panama:

DEFENDERS OF THE AMERICAN CON-  
STITUTION, INC.,

Annapolis, Md., April 17, 1973.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the United States, The White  
House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Thank you for having Mr. John Richardson, Jr., Acting Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, Department of State, respond to my recent telegram reprinted in my publication, *Task Force*. Marked attached.

After carefully reading Mr. Richardson's reply, I came to the conclusion that he is no more capable of distinguishing our many "important interests in the canal" than he is capable of understanding the distinction between a "Lieutenant" and a Lieutenant General.

Inasmuch as I have been stationed in the Canal Zone, I have often visited Panama and studied its history. I am keenly aware that the United States has vital interests in the Panama Canal. As an author and publisher who has seen the repeated efforts to amend the Treaty of 1903 by other Administrations, I assure you that I am also well aware of the consequences of any treaty which surrenders our indispensable sovereign control over the Canal Zone to any government of Panama which I have ever seen or heard of.

I can further state that the people in charge of the present government in Panama today are perhaps the worst and most unreliable of all the governments I have watched come and go in that Republic. Surrender to these people means surrender of a strategic asset vital to the existence of the United States as a sovereign nation, and no amount of sophistry can alter this fact.

I am also well acquainted with the Suez Canal, having represented the I.T. & T. in Egypt and watched that canal being turned over to the mismanagement and uncertainties of the government of Egypt. The present explosive situation in the Middle East today is due in large part to our own failure to back up the proper owners of the Canal, Britain and France.

It is my fervent hope that instead of weakly surrendering to mob pressure in Panama and an artificially created "world opinion", we should hold fast to what our country built and owns and now operates, maintains and defends for the benefit of world commerce and the safety of the United States of America, so badly threatened in the Caribbean.

Those who perennially seek to build another canal have been advised by the foremost experts on the subject that all that is needed is an expansion of the present facilities in accord with existing treaty provisions in which the form "maintenance" authorizes "expansion and new construction." The only treaty revisions that are called for are for the enlargement of the Canal Zone to include the entire watershed of the Chagres River as was once recommended by General Clarence Edwards when he was in command of the U.S. Forces of the Isthmus, and for the restoration of the 1903 Treaty Rights of the United States to supervise health and sanitation in the terminal cities of Panama and Colon, and to maintain law and order in them and other areas near the Canal Zone in the event of inability or refusal of Panama to do so.

This is not a problem to be solved by emotional considerations concerning the dis-

satisfaction of Panamanians with the 1903 Treaty and sophistical reasoning that characterizes most State Department writings on the Canal question. Panama came into being as a result of the great movement for an Isthmian Canal. The hard fact is that our existence as a sovereign nation under God is in grave peril. As an American who has participated in seven wars, large and small it grieves me to think that everything I have fought for in my 37 years of service is going down the drain because of a rabble government which does not even represent one-fifth of its people. It is this rabble government of Panama and its collaborators in the U.S.S.R., Chile, Cuba and the State Department that want to have our canal for their own profit and benefit and our officials seem to have been mesmerized into accepting the vleys of Panamanian demagogues.

I respectfully urge you to look up the technique used by Secretary Charles Evans Hughes when he handled a comparable situation affecting U.S. rights, power and authority over the Canal Zone and Canal in 1923.

Sincerely yours,

P. A. DEL VALLE,  
Lt. General U.S. Marine Corps (Ret.)  
President, Defenders of the American  
Constitution, Inc.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1973.  
Lt. P. A. DEL VALLE,  
Annandale, Va.

DEAR LIEUTENANT DEL VALLE: President Nixon has asked me to reply to your expression of concern about the Panama Canal.

The United States has important interests in the canal and the question of how we may best protect them has been receiving careful attention in the Executive Branch.

Over the years Panamanian dissatisfaction with the 1903 Treaty has been a recurring source of difficulty and tension. The United States maintains a large organization in Panama for the purpose of operating the canal and it is in our own interest that this task be carried out in a peaceful and secure environment. The canal also raises broader issues of Latin American policy. Accordingly, since 1964 we have been engaged in negotiations looking toward the revision of our relationship with Panama. The negotiations, the most recent phase of which began in June 1971, have been carried on by a negotiating team headed by Ambassador Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Secretary of the Navy. In these negotiations it is our position that the United States will continue to operate and defend the canal for an extended period of time.

It is not possible to predict if and when agreement will be reached on a new treaty, but any treaty agreed upon by the President will, of course, be submitted to the Senate for approval in accordance with the Constitution. I am enclosing a copy of an address by Ambassador David H. Ward which gives a fuller explanation of the US position in the negotiations.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN RICHARDSON, Jr.,  
Acting Assistant Secretary for Public  
Affairs.

A TELEGRAM FOR THE PRESIDENT

(By P. A. del Valle)

(The following telegram was dictated 11 March for delivery to President Nixon at the White House. The telegram takes deliberate aim at the highhanded and unlawful U.N. Security Council meeting at Panama, 15-21 March, and of which we report in our ALERT No. 97, 1 March. Unfortunately, our telegram was not delivered for reasons unknown at this time. Therefore a marked copy of

this issue of TASK FORCE will be mailed to the President instead. Ed.)

The construction of the Panama Canal, undertaken by President Theodore Roosevelt under our historic policy for an American Canal on American soil for the American people, was one of the greatest works of man. Because of the inept conduct of our inter-oceanic canal policies since World War II, the continued U.S. control of this vital waterway has been jeopardized with a grave crisis of world significance threatened during the March 15-21 U.N. Security Council sessions in Panama.

The launching of the Panama Canal was the fulfillment of the prayers and aspirations of the young republic of Panama early in this century. It is still the primary reliance for wages and income for a very important part of the Panamanian population who are friends of the U.S. in this matter. They must not be betrayed in the manner that the people of Cuba were betrayed by the pretense of a clique in the U.S. State Department and their collaborators in the mass news media that represented Fidel Castro as a bulwark of freedom and as an assured friend of the U.S. Are we to allow successors of that clique in the State Department backed by the same elements in the mass news media to contrive the same type of betrayal at Panama?

The obvious way, in fact, the only dignified way to meet the crisis is for you to direct our ambassador to the U.N. to announce immediately on convening the first session of the U.N. Security Council at Panama on March 15 the following:

1. That the United States does not recognize the right of the U.N. to intervene in U.S. domestic affairs;

2. That the U.S. will not participate in meetings hostile to it where the issue is a clearly defined historic right of U.S. sovereignty;

3. That the current negotiations with Panama are terminated; and

4. That the U.S. will proceed, regardless of the Panama Government and/or the U.N., with the major modernization of the existing Panama Canal to provide for its needed increase of capacity and operational improvement under the "maintenance" provision of existing treaties, which authorizes "expansion and new construction" for such canal.

Such policy declaration will carry forward the great work of Theodore Roosevelt, thrill the Nation, and revitalize the isthmus, with enormous benefits to both the United States and Panama and inter-oceanic commerce.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1973]

LIBYA LOAN TO PANAMA REPORTED

(By Jim Hoagland)

JERUSALEM, April 26.—Libya's military leader, Col. Muammar Qaddafi, has promised a multimillion dollar loan to the government of Panama, which is involved in a bitter controversy with the United States over the Panama Canal Zone, official Israeli sources said today.

Israel believes that Panama asked Qaddafi for a \$100 million loan earlier this month.

It is not clear how much Libya, which has about \$3 billion in monetary reserves, promised to lend Panama, or if any money has yet changed hands, the Israeli sources said.

[Close students of Libyan affairs in Washington said they were not surprised by the report about Panama.]

The Israeli sources noted that Qaddafi had promised large-scale financial aid to the African countries of Uganda and Niger when they broke diplomatic relations with Israel, but has been slow in fulfilling the commitments.

One piece of circumstantial evidence of

a possible change in Panamanian policy came during last week's Security Council debate on the Middle East, where the Panamanian position was "less friendly to Israel" than in the past, one official said.

Only last month, Libya and Panama agreed to establish diplomatic relations.

The source also cited what he said were confirmed reports that Panama had contacted Japan and other countries for a large loan before getting the Libyan agreement.

Qaddafi, who has been sharply critical of American support for Israel, has said in speeches that he is supplying aid to "revolutionary" rebels in Northern Ireland and the Philippines as well as to African and Arab countries and Islamic groups throughout the world.

## A THREAT TO PRIVACY: USDA ACCESS TO FARMERS' TAX RETURNS

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, individual privacy is fast becoming a premium in America today. Intrusions into the personal lives of many and the potential for misuse of personal data—much of which is often given voluntarily and in good faith by the citizen to his Government—have increased alarmingly. Aided by computer technology with its enormous storage and information retrieval capabilities, both government and private organizations have at their fingertips the power to compile a "profile" of an individual based on bits and pieces of data gleaned from many sources. With only a social security number or other code as a trigger, a person's most sensitive personal data can be exposed, manipulated, and misused to the detriment of the individual or for the political purposes of those in power. An example of this process of erosion of personal privacy has been unfolding the past few months, this time specifically involving the Nation's farmers.

On January 17 of this year President Nixon issued Executive Order 11697 authorizing the Department of Agriculture to inspect income tax returns filed by persons having farming operations. This order applied to returns filed for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1967. The President's stated purpose for the order was to allow the Department of Agriculture to obtain data about farm operations for statistical purposes only. It did not indicate specific data to be gathered. On January 23 new Internal Revenue Service regulations went into effect to implement the Executive order.

Neither the Executive order nor IRS regulations limited the type or amount of information that could be released to the Department of Agriculture. I quote from IRS regulations issued in conjunction with the Executive order:

The Secretary of the Treasury, or any officer or employee of the Department of the Treasury with the approval of the Secretary, may furnish the Department of Agriculture (for the purpose of obtaining data as to the farm operations of such persons) with the names, addresses, taxpayer identification numbers, or any other data on such returns or may make the returns available for inspection and



the taking of such data as the Secretary of Agriculture may designate. (Italics added).

Such blanket authority to inspect individual tax returns clearly constituted an invasion of the right of privacy of American farmers. It would allow Federal bureaucrats to rummage through confidential financial statements with no more specific motive than the desire for statistical data. Even more importantly, it would allow the Department of Agriculture—the Federal agency that controls farm policy and influences farmers' lives—to see the tax returns of individual farmers.

The opportunity for misuse of this broad Executive order was obvious. The Department of Agriculture admitted as much when its spokesman said that anyone misusing the privilege of examining tax returns would be fired.

Although I do not question the Department of Agriculture's need for statistical data, I do not believe that confidential tax returns should be the source of the information.

In testimony before the House Department Operations Subcommittee, USDA officials testified that the administration felt farm facts were so vital to American agriculture that they were willing to open up farmers' tax returns to get these facts. Yet 12 days later this same administration in releasing their new budget eliminated funds for a farm census in 1974.

Striking funds for the 1974 farm census will mean we will have an 8-year period with no major data available on agriculture. How can you open up farmers' tax returns under the disguise of needing farm facts and then 12 days later eliminate funding for the 1974 farm census?

Because of my concern over Executive Order 11697, I began a personal investigation. In several off-the-record conversations with Department of Agriculture officials, I learned that the Department had requested limited access to IRS data in 1970. In a letter to George Shultz, then Director of the Office of Management and Budget and now Secretary of the Treasury, the Department responsible for determining regulations governing access to tax returns, Secretary Hardin had requested access to certain agricultural data that could be collated with names of farm operators obtained from other sources to make a more efficient sampling list for crop estimate purposes. Secretary Hardin's letter specifically stated that he was not requesting the privilege of examining individual tax records. A sample Executive order which was restrictive was attached to Hardin's request.

The Executive order issued in January surprised Department officials because it gave them much broader powers of inspection than they had requested. Don Paarlberg, Director of Agricultural Economics for the Department, insisted that agencies under his management would not use full powers authorized by the Executive order. He wrote in reply to a letter from my colleague (Mr. ALEXANDER) of Arkansas:

The original draft of the order (requested in 1970 by the Department) was subsequent-

ly revised and its scope was broadened during the review process in the Treasury and Justice Departments. The Department's (of Agriculture) intended use is unchanged. . . . Under this order the Department seeks to acquire a list to be prepared by the Internal Revenue Service. Department employees will not examine tax returns. . . . The lists of names to be acquired will be merged with other lists maintained by the Department, and the combined lists will be used in sampling for current agricultural statistics. The lists of names are prepared by computer.

Paarlberg says:

Department employees will not examine tax returns.

Why then were provisions made in the rules and regulations governing the Executive order spelling out how USDA employees could examine individual tax returns?

Still concerned about the potential use of Executive Order 11697, I urged the Department Operations Oversight Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee to hold public hearings. Department of Agriculture and Internal Revenue Service officials testified before the subcommittee on March 28. Department officials admitted that they had received broader powers than necessary but were reluctant to relinquish their new authority. Harry Trelogan, Administrator of the Statistical Reporting Service, told the subcommittee that he had waited 3 years to get an order similar to No. 11697 and that he would resist attempts to challenge or rescind it.

On March 2, I introduced a bill H.R. 5867, which would prohibit inspection of income tax returns by the Department but would allow IRS to supply the USDA with the specific information they requested they want when they originally asked for access to IRS tax returns in 1970. Seven of my colleagues representing both parties joined me on March 28 when I reintroduced this bill. Several have since indicated they would like their names added to the bill as well.

Faced with growing opposition in the Congress, publicity in the press, and a second day of hearings scheduled for March 28 on the matter, the President issued a revised Executive Order No. 11709, on March 27. The revised order permitted Department inspection of farmers' tax returns in accordance with amended IRS regulations. These regulations limited the scope of the data which could be obtained compared with the regulations issued with the prior Executive order. The new regulations provide that only that "names, addresses, taxpayer identification numbers, type of farm activity, and one or more measures of size of farm operations such as gross income from farming or gross sales of farm products" will be furnished the Department and that before a Department official can inspect an individual tax return, all data other than the above must be blanked out.

In the original Executive order which was 11697 any employee of the USDA with permission of the Secretary of Agriculture was given authority to examine any and all tax returns of citizens showing farm income or expenses as long as

they could justify such examinations by saying it was for statistical purposes. This made the tax return of every American farmer literally an open book to the USDA. Obviously the President realized he had erred when at the insistence of many Members of Congress he rescinded his order on March 27 and issued Executive Order 11709. However, 11709 still makes farmers' returns an open book. In the revised Executive order, any employee of the USDA with permission of the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to examine any and all farmers' tax returns and to obtain any piece of information from such tax returns as long as that information can be construed to mean a measure of size of the farming operation of the taxpayer. Close examination of tax returns will clearly show that almost any piece of information on the return could be considered a measure of the size of the taxpayers' farming operation.

Although Executive Order 11709 is an improvement over the previous order, the basic issues remain—issues which I touched upon in my introductory remarks. Not only the privacy of farmers, but the privacy of all American taxpayers, is at stake here. Today we allow the Department of Agriculture to inspect farmers' tax returns for "statistical purposes only," as contended by the Department and the IRS; tomorrow the Commerce Department will be examining the tax records of businessmen, HEW the returns of doctors and HUD the tax data of homeowners. And who can guarantee that inspection will be for the limited and harmless sounding purpose of compiling statistics—statistics which in most cases can be obtained from other, less sensitive sources?

A question we must ask is why did the first Executive order give the USDA so much more authority than they requested especially since it involves the sensitive area of evading the confidentiality of the individual's tax returns. And second, why is the barn door left open in the amended Executive order? Perhaps it is because someone wants access to farmers' tax returns for reasons other than the expressed purpose of making crop and livestock reports and estimates. If there is no ulterior motive and we do seek to permit the USDA to use farmers' tax returns to gather farm facts for reporting then let us spell out a measure of size of farming operation that would be permissible to be turned over to the USDA rather than let the USDA look at any data which would be a measure of the size of farming operation which would, in effect, be almost any and all data on the farmers' tax return.

The confidentiality of income tax returns, and the assurance that information voluntarily provided on such forms will be carefully protected from disclosure or improper use, are basic notions underlying this country's system of collecting taxes and are deemed by the American people to be sacred trusts on the part of their Government. The potential for abuse is great making it incumbent upon us to be wary of setting a precedent which will destroy that confidentiality which is the bedrock of the

tax system and the citizens' faith in that system.

The policies announced over the past few months and which I have described in the first part of my remarks, pose such a precedent-setting danger. Furthermore, the fact that the group singled out now is the American farmer—at a time when the administration has practically waged war with the farmer with its drastic agricultural budget cuts and fund impoundments—makes the policy all the more suspect.

It is particularly ironic that the administration is demanding increased information on the private lives of American citizens at a time when it—to put it kindly—has been less than forthright in providing the public with information on its activities. This lack of candor and the atmosphere of coverup is not limited to the recent scandals which have tainted the administration, but is evident in the entire Government's unwillingness to allow its activities to be scrutinized by the people it is supposed to serve. The evasiveness of governmental agencies—the Department of Agriculture included—in the face of the Freedom of Information Act is only one example of this adamant refusal by the Government to open up to the people. The Government seems to expect the people to accede to its demands that even the most sensitive personal data of an individual be open to its inspection. Has the administration forgotten that in America it is the people's right to demand information from their elected officials, not the officials' right to engage in secret bugging operations or to snoop through confidential tax records?

At a time of rapidly decreasing public confidence in the institutions of Government, any policies which invite further abuse and carry with them seeds of greater public mistrust of the Government should be halted. The act of permitting inspection of farmers' tax returns is fraught with possibilities of abuse and is in contrast to the basic American principles of personal privacy. I urge my fellow Members of Congress to join me in legislative action to safeguard not only the rights of American farmers but of all citizens.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION HEARINGS CONTINUE

### HON. JOHN BRADEMÁS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BRADEMÁS. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, the Select Subcommittee on Education, which I have the honor to chair, began hearings on H.R. 3927, a bill co-sponsored by the gentlelady from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), the gentleman from New York (Mr. PEYSER), the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. HANSEN), and me, to extend the Environmental Education Act for 3 years.

We heard at that time, Mr. Speaker, from a distinguished list of public fig-

ures, including Arthur Godfrey, as well as from environmentalists and educators. All of the witnesses spoke enthusiastically in favor of extending the Environmental Education Act.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the subcommittee will continue hearings on H.R. 3927 next week.

On Tuesday, May 15, at 10 a.m., in room 2261 of the Rayburn House Office Building, we shall again hear from environmentalists and other members of the public as well as from our distinguished colleagues from Minnesota (Mr. FRENZEL) and Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT).

Also scheduled to testify on that day, Mr. Speaker, are: Richard Myshak, executive director of the Minnesota Environmental Sciences Foundation; Tony Mazzocchi, citizens legislative director of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union (AFL-CIO); and a panel including several students, along with Thomas Offutt, vice president of the Institute for Environmental Education, and Mrs. Bessie Moore, environmental education coordinator for the Arkansas State Department of Education.

On Thursday, May 17, we shall hear from the Honorable Sidney P. Marland, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, accompanied by Walter Bogan, Director of the Office of Environmental Education.

I would also at this time, Mr. Speaker, like to bring to my colleagues' attention an article on environmental education written by Linda K. Lee, a member of the National Advisory Council on Environmental Education.

The article, "Environmental Education: Education That Cannot—or Can It?—Wait" was published in the April 1973 *Smith Alumnae Quarterly*.

I insert the article at this point:

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION: EDUCATION  
THAT CANNOT—OR CAN IT?—WAIT  
(By Linda K. Lee)

In 1970, the U.S. Office of Education published a booklet entitled *Environmental Education—the Education That Cannot Wait*. Despite Presidential rhetoric, bipartisan Congressional support and the enthusiastic efforts of some government officials, educators and concerned citizens, however, the environmental education program enacted by Congress in 1970 has waited in the anterooms of federal bureaucracy for nearly three years. Unless Congress acts before June 30, 1973, it may pass into oblivion. How it happened, from the perspective of one edge of power, is the story of this article.

"Let no man jump to the conclusion that he must take his PhD in ecology before he can 'see' his country. . . ." Aldo Leopold.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT

It was in the spirit of Dr. Leopold that Congress enacted the Environmental Education Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-516). An initiative of Congressman John Brademas, an Indiana Democrat with an Oxford PhD, the Act was based on the conviction that the threat to environmental quality was in part due to a poor understanding of ecology, and a lack of resources for education in the field. The bill received bipartisan support and passed both Houses of Congress by wide margins.

President Nixon lent his verbal support for the concept, stating in the Congress-

sional message accompanying the first report of the Council on Environmental Quality that "environmental literacy . . . will require the development and teaching of environmental concepts at every point in the educational process."

Environmental education was not to be another item in the already crowded curriculum, to rank alongside math, history or literature, but rather, in the words of the Act, part of "the educational process dealing with man's relationship with his natural and man-made surroundings."

To add this new dimension in learning, the Act established an Office of Environmental Education within the U.S. Office of Education to carry out a grant program to universities, school systems and public and private agencies. Among the activities to be encouraged were curriculum development, information dissemination, preservice and inservice training for educational personnel, and community education programs. The Act authorized a three year program with funding of \$5, \$15, and \$25 million.

To advise the Office, the Act created an Advisory Council on Environmental Education to consist of twenty-one members with "not less than three ecologists and three students."

#### IMPLEMENTATION

As outlined, environmental education program did not appear to differ much from a number of other categorical education programs funded by the Congress during the 1960's. Environmental education, however, started out with at least one major handicap in Washington; the legislation was initiated on Capitol Hill, not in the executive branch. Federal officials often have a built-in resistance to new programs for fear that they will somehow intrude on previously protected "turf." This is compounded when the new program emanates from the wrong end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

It should not have been surprising, therefore, that a campaign began almost immediately to cripple environmental education. Nearly a year passed before the new Office was formally established; it was several months and several physical moves later before it could truly be called functional. More than a year passed before the Advisory Council was appointed and held its first meeting.

#### ADVISORY COUNCIL

It was into this legislative-executive tangle that unsuspecting Advisory Council appointees walked in December 1971. For Julia Brown Perry '60 of Tucson, Arizona and myself, it was quite an experience. We were neither students nor ecologists and attendance at Smith was not among the statutory descriptions of Council members who were to be "... appointed from the public and private sector with due regard to their fitness, knowledge, and experience in matters of, but not limited to, academic, scientific, medical, legal, resource conservation and production, urban and regional planning and information media activities as they relate to our society and affect our environment. . . ."

If our personal roles were somewhat vague, our mandate from the Congress was clear; we were to advise the Commissioner of Education on the operation of the Act, make recommendations on the allocation of funds, develop criteria to be used in making grants, and evaluate and disseminate information about funded programs.

#### FUNDING

By the time we first met, however, planning for Fiscal Year 1971 grants was already well underway. Since the Administration had actually opposed the enactment of the legislation, it was not about to fight to fund it. Only a last minute \$2 million Congressional appropriation enabled the program to begin. In the first year, only 74 awards totaling \$1.7 million (against an authorization of



\$5 million) could be made. Because of the delays, the Advisory Council had had no input into the preparation of criteria for grants but found itself summoned before an oversight hearing by the Brademas Subcommittee in April 1972 with very little to report. We had, however, elected officers, approved by-laws and established subcommittees which were hard at work on our Congressional charge.

Meanwhile, the inexorable calendar had the Office of Environmental Education preparing to send out guidelines for 1972 fiscal year funding, still without meaningful participation by the Council. At the oversight hearing, Congressman Brademas berated the Deputy Commissioner of Education for failing to consult with the Council and charged that the Office was deliberately ignoring the dictates of P.L. 91-516.

The 1972 funding situation was also precarious and the Office ended up with some \$2.5 million for projects in all 50 states, Puerto Rico and the Mariana Islands. The Council itself suffered from a lack of funds. \$50,000 was made available to cover travel and related expenses in holding meetings, but we had no permanent staff and had to draw upon the already burdened Office of Environmental Education for assistance in making meeting arrangements, processing travel vouchers and obtaining information on environmental education developments around the country. There was literally nothing left over to keep ourselves informed of the activities of other government agencies, or to conduct on-site visits of funded programs unless they happened to be located within the area of a full Council meeting. The Office itself never was permitted to hire a full staff complement and was working nights and weekends to meet shifting "higher level" deadlines for review of grant applications.

#### CONTINUED PROBLEMS

By June, 1972, the Advisory Council had prepared criteria for incorporation by the Office in project guidelines for Fiscal Year 1973, presumably the last year of the program, but we had yet to see any projects in the field. Late that month, as the 1972 awards were announced, we met in Minneapolis and had our first opportunity to visit projects operated with federal, state and local funds. This experience gave us new ideas to take back home and new perspectives for inclusion in project guidelines. By September we were back in Washington confronting a host of bureaucratic problems; a new director of the Office, new Council members to bring up to date, a new set of guidelines for advisory committees from the Office of Committee Management in HEW, and a campaign adjournment of Congress without an appropriations measure (the President vetoed the first bill) to cover the Office for Fiscal 1973. At this point, many of us wondered if we were advisors or firefighters.

#### ADMINISTRATION HOSTILITY

We met again this January, again not to advise but to prepare our obligatory annual report to the Commissioner of Education. Officially due on March 31, we were informed that it must be in final form early in February in order to meet "printers' deadlines." Two days after the conclusion of our meeting, the President's Budget Message to the Congress announced that no funds would be requested for the Office of Environmental Education since the Act was due to expire on June 30. What will happen to the Office after that date or to funded projects still underway is unclear. Congressman Brademas has introduced legislation extending the program for another three years with total funding of \$60 million, but it is uncertain whether the Congress can complete action on the measure before June 30. Meanwhile, environmental education has become another pawn in the Executive-Congressional confrontation over revenue sharing versus bloc grants, impound-

ment and the constitutional authority of the legislative branch.

Where are we, then, as a Council each of whose members undertook the responsibility in good faith and with the conscientious intent to carry out our legislative charge?

Whatever our individual backgrounds, each of us is certainly better educated with respect to the bureaucratic environment if not the physical one. We have seen some good programs in process; we have hopes for some experimental efforts still in preparation. Certainly our belief in the need for environmental education for all age groups, through formal and non-formal processes, with public and private agency support has not lessened.

#### COUNCIL'S POSITION

The Council's 1973 report calls for the extension and full funding of P.L. 91-516. Only if the program is continued will we ever be able to evaluate the results of efforts such as that of the environmental public education TV project in Western Massachusetts to increase public awareness of the environmental threat to the Connecticut River Watershed; of the Tucson Audubon's program to demonstrate how man can fit into the desert environment without devastating it; of a Washington, D.C. community group's effort to mobilize citizens to evaluate the quality of their drinking water.

It is of such programs that this article should have been written. Environmental education is that important.

But at this point in time, it is difficult to assess whether the existence of the environmental education program, and of the Council itself has had any impact—positive or negative. We may, through hot air and excess paper flow, actually have had a negative impact! It is relatively easy to evaluate the impact of citizen action on a community; highway construction on parkland is or is not prevented; a recycling center collected X bottles last week. Perhaps we have learned another law of bureaucracy: the level of frustration of the participant rises in direct proportion with the level of government served.

We hope our experience as a Council is not typical. Regardless, I, for one, don't regret it. We may have won a few little bureaucratic victories—or at least put out a few fires. And I'd like to think that through our efforts and those of the Office of Environmental Education the importance of environmental education has been more clearly perceived and is more articulately supported.

#### PREDISASTER RELIEF

### HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill in the House to require the President to furnish predisaster relief to the East Bay Hills area of California. The bill is companion legislation to S. 1697, introduced by Senators CRANSTON and TUNNEY. Hearings were held in the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, and the following is my testimony inserted into the record of those hearings:

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am appearing before you today to voice my unqualified support for S. 1697, requiring the President to declare the East Bay Hills a Disaster Area. The evidence and testimony you will be presented today by those local and state officials most directly

involved will surely be powerful and moving. I do not believe that I can better state the case. The men and women here today representing the people who stand to suffer so drastically in the event of a fire, and who must undergo serious economic hardship in preventive measures can best convey the enormous proportions of the impending tragedy.

I would like however to take this opportunity to convey to the Members of the Committee the history of attempts made to date by myself and my staff to alleviate the fire hazard. Perhaps it will then be apparent to you, as it has become to me, that Presidential action in the form of a designation of the area as one of "imminent disaster" is imperative. Without it there is little that can be done to compensate for the great financial hardships of so many. And naturally, without such a declaration the possibility and peril of impending fire disaster grows with each warm, dry spring day.

Nearly all efforts to date to secure emergency relief funds have been futile. Money is traditionally available from various sources and government agencies. For many technical reasons, however, this situation in the Hills does not qualify. Money that might have been released by HUD, by the Department of Labor, the U.S. Forest Service, the State of California, the Department of Agriculture and other smaller agencies has simply not been forthcoming. We have been forced into the realization that our disaster simply does not conform to the requirements now in the statutes for anything other than a "state of emergency". It is indeed a sad commentary that tragedy must occur before funds that would have been preventive can be released.

Beginning in late February, we initiated explorations into possible sources of aid for the area. Our first task was to build a conclusive case that the trees were indeed dead, and thus a grave threat. The only known precedent, the freeze of 1932, had caused initial damage and all the eucalyptus trees appeared dead. Within a number of years, however, they were revived so that many of those in question are demonstrated survivors of a serious frost.

We called on the Park Service and the Forest Service in this initial period for advice and evaluation. At that time we believed them to be a good potential source of aid in the event that the trees would have to be cleared. The Forest Service, of the Department of Agriculture, claimed jurisdiction in the matter and began working with state and local officials on the scene. Aerial views and infra red photos were used as evidence, but proved to be disappointingly inconclusive. Portions of the trees, themselves, were analyzed in laboratory tests and determined to be alive but still dangerously inflammable. It became apparent that so many concerned parties with conflicting standards were involved that there would be no simple resolution. An unbiased judgement would have to be made by a single party.

My Washington staff, during this same time frame, was investigating every federal agency that had relief programs even remotely related to fire disaster. The Library of Congress, the Department of the Interior, and the Public Works Committee proposed various possibilities, but all were revealed to be unsuitable. Watershed programs seemed likely to be applicable but their overall budget had been so drastically cut in recent years that no substantial funds could be made available. We were then speaking conservatively of \$5 million in damages. The total budget of the Watershed programs amounted to very little more than that. Similar findings were made in all the other federal disaster relief programs.

The only conclusion to this exhaustive study was that money would have to be made available through the Office of Emer-

agency Preparedness. This necessitated a Presidential designation of the area as an "imminent disaster". I conveyed this message to the President by letter on April 4. After a lengthy review, Governor Reagan arrived at the same conclusion on the first week of April. He declared a "state of emergency" in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, and requested President Nixon to "declare the counties major disaster areas due to the extreme fire hazard presented by the dead trees". In this same statement he directed that a Fire Prevention Center at the East Bay Regional Park Headquarters would be established to begin fire abatement procedures. In conclusion, though, he too appealed for the availability of Small Business Administration Disaster Loans. It seemed the only recourse for private property and homeowners.

The Governor has made limited amount of funds available for land clearance, and the California Ecology Corps has been enlisted in the land clearing effort. While an earnest beginning, this is still pitifully insufficient. Estimates of damage, and of expenses to the property owners now range upwards of \$5 million, and \$20 million is no longer considered a liberal figure. Very few private citizens have such resources available to them. A homeowner with several dead trees on his property is faced with an extremely expensive operation, but a family living on a fixed income with even just a few trees in the yard may encounter serious financial hardships. These people must be compensated, or reimbursed. And all those who have not yet made large expenditures must be assisted before that should become necessary. Time is running out. William Hildebrand, the Fire Marshall of Alameda, has set June 1 as the deadline. At that date all dead trees must be cleared from private land. Estimates range upward of \$300 per tree.

As a last resort, the manpower element was explored. It was thought that the Department of Labor might have sufficient funds to deploy large groups of previously unemployed men and women into land-clearing operations. Public Service Employment has in the past given jobs to hundreds of people in projects similar to this one. This year's drastic shortage of funds in the program, however, rendered this impossible. The City of Oakland could not afford to hire anyone. Public funds might have been provided for the immediate future, but under the same laws it is stipulated that no one may be hired temporarily unless the city can guarantee him continued employment when the project is completed. No such money for salaries could be found in the Oakland city government.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps was then briefly considered. This possibility was even more quickly rejected—NYC's funding expires on June 30, 1973. Revenue sharing, as we are all aware, is not committed to the continuance of any program. There are no guarantees.

I am pleased to be able to report to the members of this Committee, though, that we have been able to make one small step in the area of compensation to property owners. No final decision has yet been reached but preliminary reports from the Internal Revenue Service confirm that some relief through tax deduction may be forthcoming. We do not know how much, if any, of the cost of tree removal will be deductible. But we do know that the IRS will permit any property owner to claim the difference in his property value before and after tree clearance as a single deduction. This is small consolation, but surely a beginning.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, we have explored every existing avenue. Congressman Dellums, Congressman Waldie, Senator Tunney and yourself, Mr. Chairman, have done all within our power and authority to provide relief to this en-

dangered area. The local governments, the mayors of many towns, county supervisors, state officials and innumerable citizens have worked tirelessly to avert disaster. The Governor of California, Ronald Reagan, intervened on behalf of all these people and declared the area one of "imminent disaster."

We have all answered our constituencies. We have lived up to our responsibilities as elected officials. The President has let us down. He has refused to live up to his obligations. The President turned his back on East Bay Hills residents whose homes and property are threatened by the worst Bay Area disaster since the 1906 earthquake and fire.

We now must turn to you, the members of this Committee, and to the Congress to compel the President to respond. There are no other sources of relief. Only he can make the authorization for the release of Federal Disaster Relief Funds. Small Business Administration loans, provided through the Office of Emergency Preparedness, cannot be made available unless the President so directs. On behalf of all those who are undergoing such hardship now, and who stand to be so severely afflicted in the event of fire, I cannot urge you too strongly to consider this bill favorably and work for its rapid adoption.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

#### SOVIET JEWS AND EDUCATION TAX

#### HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Soviet Jew is of justified concern to many millions of Americans. Many of us in the Congress have expressed concern about the so-called education tax which is nothing more than a threat and blackmail against those who wish to emigrate.

All too often, however, we do not hear very much about what is happening in other governmental bodies, outside the Congress. In New Jersey, we are most fortunate in having a State assemblyman who has spoken out consistently in his support for the Soviet Jews. He is Assemblyman Eugene Bedell, one of the more able officials in the New Jersey State Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, under the leadership of Assemblyman Bedell, the New Jersey State Legislature on April 30, 1973, unanimously passed a resolution sponsored by Mr. Bedell memorializing Congress to withhold preferential trade treatment with the Soviet Union until the head tax on its Jewish citizens is eliminated.

Because of the grave concern in the Congress over this sensitive subject, I am including a copy of Mr. Bedell's resolution in the RECORD:

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 2029—STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas, In the Soviet Union men and women are denied freedoms recognized as basic by all civilized countries and indeed by the Constitution of the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, The government of the Soviet Union is persecuting Jewish citizens by denying them the same rights and privileges accorded other recognized religions in the Soviet Union; and

Whereas, The right to freely emigrate, which is denied Soviet Jews, is a right affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and

Whereas, These violations of basic human rights are an obstacle to the development of better relations between the people of the United States and the people of the Soviet Union; now, therefore

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized to consider the plight of Soviet Jews prior to granting most-favored-nation status to the Soviet Union, and to call upon the Soviet government to end its persecution of the Jews, in accordance with the Soviet Constitution, and to permit its citizens to emigrate, as affirmed by the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights; and

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President, the Secretary of State of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each member thereof from the State of New Jersey.

#### CONSTITUENT CONVEYS COMMON-SENSE

#### HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mrs. Vogelsang of Clawson, Mich., has rewarded Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN and me with her pithy comments on a number of the conditions faced by Americans today—problems which Mrs. Vogelsang feels could be solved or minimized with a heavy dose of commonsense.

The letter follows for the interest of my colleagues in the Federal Government:

(NOTE.—Thoughts inspired by TV programs, commercials, radio programs, newscasts, editorial comments on TV by news personnel, magazines and other people's newspapers—as we quit taking a paper over a year ago).

In the same day I heard Jack LaLanne, on his program, and a TV message with Rafer Johnson speaking on supporting the physical fitness programs in our schools. I wonder if they call 30-45 minutes a week of gym, in one of these suburban white schools, a fitness program? Then the gym teacher expects these kids to do reasonably well in the President's Award program.

If they pass and get an award I am sure it must be due to eating all these vitamin fortified cereals that most mothers I know feed their children because it's easy to fix and the children will at least be eating something. Certain government agencies won't agree with this which leads me to thoughts on food.

Just what is a wife and mother to feed her family nowadays? By the time I get through trying to plan a weeks balanced meals at a reasonable cost, that everyone in the family will like, I'm too exhausted to eat it. I have been going through this mental anguish for 10 years now and so far we have survived without FDA's help. All they do is confuse me so I've stopped listening. All these minimum weekly and daily nutritional needs don't seem to take into affect that my family hates liver and all yellow vegetables, except rutabaga occasionally. I hate spinach, they will eat scallops once a month and on and on. Apparently, those government experts just



love to eat any and everything and assume the masses will follow their suggestions.

*Expert*—would someone define that word for me? I am tired of hearing it. I consider myself an expert in every field the government has a department for. Our home, in Clawson, is equivalent to the White House. My husband is the President. I'm the Vice President as I take over when he's gone. I am the Sec. of the Treasury—as he claims he has enough trouble earning the money and making out bills gets him nauseous—so I do the money management. I am the Sec. of State—I go about negotiating treaties between our children who go to war once a day (we have one boy 10 and one girl 7). As the Sec. of Labor—I work at keeping the house presentable and neat. As Sec. of HEW I am seeing we stay reasonably healthy, the children get to school on time and looking out for their welfare is no small task. I am the President's social secretary, which is not a big job, but once in a while he does have to relax. We share the Sec. of Agriculture job and in the summer we even employ the children. I am the Sec. of Transportation, Sec. of HUD, etc. I could continue, but I've said enough. What I want to know then—how does the government define expert? I have been married 11½ years and that has got to make me an expert on something—maybe being an idiot because in spite of all this I don't want to be a "liberated" woman.

I have no desire to go out and earn a living. I spent three years working, while in college after my father died at the end of my freshman year, to earn extra money. I worked during the summers to earn tuition, room and board. I agree with very little of Woman's Lib and I feel Congress is going a little overboard for women now. Too many jobs are being held by married women with children and for each job they hold (and a lot of these jobs are unnecessary second incomes) there is a man out of work who might have a family to try and support.

I am also tired of hearing about "assembly line boredom." Any job can be boring—even mine. I do basically the same thing every day from getting up at the same time Monday thru Friday, making beds, three meals, washing, ironing, dishes and so on. All this boredom business is a crock of you know what in my opinion.

Speaking of employment! I wonder how long it will take politicians to stop campaigning on a platform of "elect me and you'll have a job!" There will never be total employment—that is a Utopian dream, just as total equality. (It is a fine idea, but I still labor under the idea that Utopia would be an absolute bore.) Mass production and machines that can do a man's job have helped unemployment rise, but I have yet to hear anyone mention this.

This leads me to unions. I can see they have their place in a democracy and I understand that union people are now becoming more independent thinkers, but I get the impression that business profits make unions want more money and if they get an increase prices rise because they're supposed to have more money to spend and things are at a Mexican standoff and no one seems to benefit—the Vicious Circle Theory as I call it.

My husband doesn't belong to a union, but works for Ford Motor Corporation. If things keep up in his office the way they are going I am assuming an anti-unionist will become a pro white collar unionist. The business of getting ahead in a corporation is just as bad as running for Congress, unless you've had 10 years experience and are 20 years old, have a relative in high places or are prepared to kiss fannies you are just liable to sit around collecting dust even though you have that all important degree from an institution of higher learning. Doing a good job doesn't count and by the time you reach 35 you're old.

Speaking of age—if the average working slob has to retire at 65 how come everybody in Congress and the Supreme Court is hitting their prime at that age? (Maybe it takes that long to become an "expert" in government.) There seems to be a flagrant violation of age discrimination between my husband's job and the men sitting on that bench. Why shouldn't they have to retire at 65? Airline pilots have to stop flying at 60, maybe it has something to do with judgment and alertness, if this is so there should definitely be retirement for Justices for these same reasons.

My husband and I have all but stopped watching TV. The programs are lousy, but those stupid commercials are worse. What a horrible picture I draw of the so called average human being. He has dirty hair, smelly armpits, bad teeth, a congested nose, bloodshot eyes, constant headaches, bad breath, weak fingernails, constipation, bad stomachs, hemorrhoids and smelly feet to mention a few of the maladies. The place they live in is just as bad—little men in your toilet bowl to keep it clean, dirty windows, floors and carpets, dusty furniture and house atolls, but at least there is a cure for this—just building your home in a large lemon! Oh, how I long for the nice music and lovely scenery of the cigarette commercials. Personally, I resent these agencies of the government that are now demanding these ads be proven, especially of the auto industry now. Do they think we are so stupid that we actually believe all these commercials?

There are too many programs devoted to educating the pre-schooler. My children didn't watch these programs and my boy has been an all A student since first grade and my daughter is also doing well. I think this rush to have our children well educated leads to boredom in school because they know it all before they get there. I would, however, suggest TV learning as a means of eliminating all schools, therefore, we will eliminate financial problems like Detroit has and the solution to the ridiculous busing issue. It would be cheaper to supply children with TV sets than buses—even the maintenance would be cheaper.

The word repair brings Ralph Nader to mind. He wants to repair everything it seems. I'm waiting for him to have to get his nose repaired when somebody punches it. I will give the man his due, but when he can run the Corvair right off the assembly line and a few years later say he might have been wrong—the man has gone a bit far. Due to him I don't want to buy a new car. Each new car we buy goes back to the dealer more often than the last due to these recalls. I heard the other day he's checking up on eight small airplane companies—how nice.

While driving the other day I heard, on the car radio, some mention about a conviction of somebody in the Watergate Affair. Why is everyone trying to grab some headlines in this stupid farce? I think that by the election results, if nothing else, it should be evident that people really appear to feel like Rhett Butler—they don't give a damn. The average person, I feel, has enough smarts to realize that this type of campaigning has gone on probably since John Adams and someone just happened to get caught this time. People have more important things to worry about today than Watergates, like trying to keep their head above water.

A big deal is being made about Watergate and yet the "common" criminal on the street isn't as sought after as a bunch of bugs—and gun control is not the answer! If a person feels compelled to commit any type of crime he will find a weapon even if it's nothing more than a metal nailfile. If it were left up to me I would rather be shot than stabbed or a saw blade run across my neck.

I realize the possibility of ending an innocent person's life exists when you have capital punishment, but holy cow the crime rate

is getting ridiculous all over the world and we seem to be the only country trying to be so darn civilized we are becoming barbaric. If capital punishment doesn't appeal to you there is always the old Oriental method, as Billy Graham hinted, rapists could be castrated, thieves could have a hand cut off, etc. There is not enough money to ever make me want to become a policeman. From a layman's observation they should walk around in their own handcuffs with no bullets in their guns. Court dockets are apparently overcrowded, first offenders are out on bail committing a second crime, the jails are overcrowded, and the prisoners are rioting for various and assorted reasons and now someone wants to run the jails like hotels with visiting wives. This may be OK for the check forger, but for a murderer I wholeheartedly disagree. He is in prison for punishment, not for fun and frolic. Richard Speck and Sirhan Sirhan should have been executed immediately after their trials were over instead of undergoing psychiatric treatment. Of course a person like this is sick and I feel society would be better off without him (or her). Now Bobby Seale is running for mayor of Oakland, but why not?—this is a democracy and we have a constitutional government.

The word unconstitutional is beginning to grate me. It seems everything is unconstitutional nowadays in some respect and maybe some of the earthquakes are due to our forefathers (and even foremothers) spinning around in their graves. The Bill of Rights makes me wonder who's being billed for whose rights.

I am developing the attitude that if you don't contribute to society (and I don't mean the contribution of more children) you don't deserve any. But this is a whole letter in itself so I will stop here on this subject because it leads to the subject of welfare. Only one comment on this—if welfare is undignified let people refuse it and fill their stomachs with dignity. It won't be long before malnutrition sets in and then they may be forced to chew up and swallow their pride.

Swallowing goes along with food and I am not going to let Virginia Nower (phonetic spelling so if it's wrong I apologize) know how I manage to feed my family the same as I did last year even with increased food costs, and I am not a hamburger fancier. I do find it funny though that IRS is so concerned about car repair costs, which is not usually a daily expense, but no one seems to be caring about food costs and eating is something my family likes to do everyday. In the Detroit metropolitan area Farmer Jack's food stores are cutting beef prices 20% for a period of time. If they are making a profit at this reduced price why can't these be the regular prices? It appears, on the surface, that normally all Jack does is get a higher profit. Profit is essential to the economy but does it have to be such a big one.

I think I have bored you enough if you are actually reading this so a few short closing comments:

Busing. I abhor the idea, but if it follows this country's normal actions it will be the person be damned so roll out the busses, with Naders and NAACP's approval, and a few years from now the educators will realize it isn't solving anything and they'll have to find some other equal way to educate the kids.

Vietnam. Too bad Sen. Goldwater didn't get elected in 1964. I still admire him.

Pollution and Ecology. We must cure tomorrow, ills that took many years to develop and if we can't cure it we'll just levy fines.

Killing of government people. At least we're not alone in this area. Pretty soon the whole world may be one big Banana Republic.

It is amazing, if one reads history, to find out that basically the middle class (of which our family is part) has gone unchanged over the years. They have borne the brunt of

everyone picking on them in one way or another and yet have managed to survive to support this country in every respect from manpower to money. If nothing else, it only goes to prove they manage to survive in spite of and not because of.

**MENTAL HEALTH ASSOCIATION OF  
ESSEX COUNTY, N.J.**

**HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the history of care for the mentally ill in this country should be a source of embarrassment to every American. For too long the large residential psychiatric hospital has been our single resource in treating mental illness. Only 2 of 50 States have made the commitment to provide adequate mental health care—California and Kentucky.

Yet one of every two hospital beds is occupied by a mentally ill person. Mental illness is recognized by industry as the single most contributor to absenteeism and concomitant loss of business. In fact, untold millions, perhaps billions, of dollars are lost each year due to mental illness. One of every 10 Americans requires, in his life, some sort of emotional help.

Only recently has this country begun to develop new approaches to the treatment of mental illness. In the last 10 years we have financed community-based mental health programs to treat people in their communities without having to institutionalize them. For the vast majority of residential patients and individuals barely coping day-to-day, outside psychiatric hospitals, this approach has proven itself as most effective, humane, and economical.

New technologies are under study which may someday isolate causes of mental and emotional illness and lead to even more effective treatment. With new forms of prevention and treatment, we may be able to reduce significantly the impact of mental illness in this country.

The Mental Health Association of Essex County is a citizens' organization committed to improved public and private services and policies in the area of mental health. It has represented the public interest in the development and evaluation of mental health programs. It has a proud history of vanguarding the struggle for strong right to treatment laws, community-based mental health centers, improved treatment in psychiatric hospitals, and protection of patients from institutional peonage.

The Mental Health Association has entered the human services field itself, when necessary, to provide qualitative services to this county. Their program of low-cost psychotherapy was the first of its kind in the country. Their school for autistic children—Garden School—which is now sponsored by the Belleville public schools, has received international recognition. Prospect House, a partial

hospitalization-psychiatric rehabilitation program, is sponsored by the Mental Health Association, which also provides ongoing day-to-day personal and family counseling services to the community.

To support the programs, this private nonprofit organization has undertaken this year a dynamic and creative approach to fund raising. They are sponsoring a gala ball at the new Newark International Airport at the TWA terminal.

I applaud these efforts and call on every citizen to support this vital organization.

**THE VITAMIN BILL MAKES SENSE**

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, 137 of our colleagues have cosponsored my bill, H.R. 643, which would prevent the Food and Drug Administration from trying to dictate what vitamins and mineral supplements Americans should or could take.

Many of us are aroused at the thought of the FDA putting unneeded restrictions and regulations on vitamins and vitamin supplements. This, in my opinion, is just another attempt by the bureaucrats to control our very lives. I am confident the majority of the American people have the wisdom and good sense to consume these items properly and beneficially.

I include as a portion of my remarks an article from Prevention magazine entitled "Were the 'Vitamin Hearings' a Hoax?"

WERE THE "VITAMIN HEARINGS" A HOAX?

(By Robert Bahr)

The longest, most expensive and most emotional hearings in the history of the Food and Drug Administration, which began in 1968, came to a conclusion in January of this year with the issuance of a series of dietary regulations.

The "defendants" in this bizarre case were nutritional supplements—vitamins, minerals, and other concentrated foodstuffs. They stood accused of being worthless. Claims that they could provide health and well-being were branded as fraudulent. People who sold them were accused of being "quacks," and those who took them, "faddists." The penalty asked by the Food and Drug Administration, which prosecuted the case, was severe restriction on the sale, formulation, and labeling of these supplements, which would be appropriate to products which have little or no value to the consumer.

The verdict, as seen in the new Dietary Supplement Regulations of 1973, was guilty as charged. Somehow, this was both surprising and not surprising.

To those who followed the hearings closely between 1968 and 1970, the long-awaited verdict was shocking for the simple reason that there was very little in the testimony to suggest that the FDA had proved its case against dietary supplements. In fact, there had been a tremendous amount of evidence presented by the experts which suggested the opposite of what the FDA set out to prove. In addition, some 55,000 aroused Americans had sent letters to the hearing clerk, blasting the FDA proposals as an unwarranted trespass against their freedom of choice.

But what made the verdict not so surprising after all is the curious fact that besides prosecuting the case, the FDA was also the jury! They and they alone decided the merits of the testimony, and then further decided what the "sentence" should be.

Now you may ask, why should a U.S. regulatory agency spend over one million dollars in tax money to put on a two-year hearing if they aren't going to pay any attention to the testimony? The answer is that the FDA only mounted the hearing as a sop to public opinion when a cry of outrage greeted their proposals, back in 1962, to impose stringent new regulations on vitamin supplements. They had no intention, originally, of holding hearings, but public opposition was so intense that at the last minute, just before the rules were to go into effect, the agency backed off and announced that it would let vitamin advocates have their "day in court."

Most of the people involved in the hearings no doubt thought they were being held in good faith. That is, that the FDA would objectively consider all the testimony from the experts, give some weight, perhaps, to opinions mailed in by the public, and then come to a sound decision. It seemed, at the time, that this is what they planned. Why else would they pay for some 90 witnesses to appear on their behalf? And if they weren't sincere, why would they let the hearings continue for 2 long years?

Were the so-called "vitamin hearings" just a mockery of justice put on at the expense of the taxpayers? This is a question you have to answer yourself. Here, we will present in boiled-down form the major features and confrontations of the hearings, in what we consider to be an objective manner. Read the testimony with an open mind, and you be the judge.

**U.S. COURT TELLS FDA IT CANNOT DICTATE DIET**

The FDA warmed up for its assault by making a number of raids and seizures without benefit of any regulations whatsoever to support its actions. In 1963, they seized 568 cases of Dextra sugar on charges of misbranding and ordered the manufacturer, in effect, out of existence. In court, the FDA argued that Dextra labels stating the sugar contained minerals and B vitamins—which was true—were misleading because people would think Dextra was better than other sugars.

U.S. District Judge Emmett C. Choate ruled against the FDA in 1964. He said the FDA brought the charges because "it is not in sympathy with its (Dextra's) use. The provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act did not vest in the Food and Drug Administration or any other Federal agency power to determine what foods should be included in the American diet. This is the function of the market place."

Judge Choate added, "Plainly, only Congress can or should regulate the use of vitamins, and then only to prevent public injury." The FDA appealed the case to higher courts, but Choate's ruling was upheld. In effect, the decision told the FDA to keep its hands off nutritional supplements, since its only authority is to regulate the purity of foods, but not to decide that some foods may be sold and others not.

Entirely disregarding this ruling, the FDA continued to pick off small vitamin firms that could not afford to defend themselves against the Federal Government in court. In Kansas City, the agency used bugging devices to obtain evidence that two lady school teachers were demonstrating a product called Allerjoy, a milk substitute for children and adults allergic to milk.

By 1965, protest that the agency was trampling on citizen's constitutional rights in order to put the vitamin firms out of business were so strong that the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice Pro-



cedure undertook hearings. One of the witnesses, K. W. Dilling, an attorney for the National Association of Food Supplement Manufacturers and Distributors, told Senator Edward Long who headed the Committee, "This is trampling upon traditional American rights. The planting of these devices is thoroughly un-American and thoroughly reprehensible." Dilling added, "The use of 'snooping devices' is a very common practice of this agency . . . sometimes they 'bug' a whole house. It's been my experience in dealing with FDA cases that the use of these devices is extensive, general, and accepted by this agency."

When the hearings were over, Senator Long concluded, "If the FDA spent less time spying on and raiding small manufacturers of vitamins, and more time looking into the large firms which manufacture dangerous drugs like thalidomide, the situation would be greatly improved."

#### NEW BOGEYMAN: THE "VICIOUS FOOD FADDIST"

So the FDA changed tactics. A year later, the new FDA Commissioner, James Goddard, began talking once again about the vitamin regulations. He said in an interview that they were necessary because "avaricious and vicious food faddists and nutritional quacks were foisting worthless products on the public." In June, 1966, Goddard issued the "final" regulations.

They weren't final for long, for the day they were issued all hell broke loose. Here is what the regulations required:

Potency of supplements was not to exceed the Recommended Dietary Allowances established by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council.

Only certain combinations of vitamins and minerals, dictated by the FDA, would be permitted.

Manufacturers were to be prohibited from saying on a label that their product was from a natural source rather than from a synthetic one.

It was to be forbidden to state that any food or supplement was effective for the treatment or prevention of any ailment, including diseases caused by deficiency of the nutrients contained in the supplement.

It would be forbidden to state or imply that significant segments of the U.S. population are suffering from a vitamin deficiency or even face the possibility of developing such a deficiency.

Advertising dare not suggest that deficiencies can develop because ordinary foods lose nutritive value when they are grown in poor soil, or because of losses in storage, transportation, processing, or cooking.

And just in case anyone had missed the point, the regulations required this statement, known as the "crepe label," on every bottle of vitamins and minerals:

"Vitamins and minerals are supplied in abundant amounts by the foods we eat. The Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council recommends that dietary needs be satisfied by foods. Except for persons with special medical needs, there is no scientific basis for recommending routine use of dietary supplements."

It immediately became clear that someone at the FDA had an overactive imagination. Dr. LeRoy Voris, executive secretary of the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences, said that he didn't know where the FDA got the exact phrase that his organization "recommends that dietary needs be satisfied by foods." Dr. Voris was also unaware of any communication between the FDA and Food and Nutrition Board concerning the label statement. "Nor has the Board reviewed or approved the labeling requirements," Dr. Voris added.

As for the scientific basis of the dietary allowances on which the FDA placed so much emphasis, the Food and Nutrition Board publicly commented that "the allowances do

not necessarily reflect the nutritional need of any one person or group, since these can be judged only after careful clinical, biochemical and physical evaluations have been made."

#### TOP NUTRITIONISTS JOIN ATTACK ON PROPOSALS

Other top nutritionists joined in the attack on the crepe label, and the assumptions behind it. Thomas H. Jukes, lecturer in nutrition at the University of California at Berkeley, wrote, "The first sentence (vitamins and minerals are supplied in abundant amounts by the food we eat) is a generalization which does not apply to individual cases. I do not think that any professor of nutrition would give a passing grade to a student who made such a statement." He added: "There is a strong basis for recommending routine use of dietary supplements to make sure that overt signs and symptoms do not develop in persons who have unrecognized special needs."

Pediatrician George M. Owen of Ohio State University Children's Hospital said, "It is mistakenly assumed that most people in this country receive a diet adequate in all respects simply because of the abundant food supply. The fact is, that the nutritional status of the people of the United States is not known, and no one has a right to pass laws guessing at it. It is discouraging to see the Government forming regulations pertaining to matters for which scientists have not yet provided information," he concluded.

Even the United States Department of Agriculture attacked the regulations issued by its fellow agency. Assistant Agriculture Secretary George L. Mehren said the crepe label, "will give the consumer a false sense of security. . . . The most recent nation-wide survey indicates that 38 per cent of households have diets that do not meet the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council Recommended Dietary Allowances in one or more nutrients."

Within two months after the regulations were issued in "final" form, the FDA had received 55,000 letters of protest! Consumers, nutritionists, and more than 100 food and drug companies were clamoring for a hearing. The FDA argued that a hearing was not necessary—because the 1966 regulations were not really new, but a revision of some 1962 regulations. Yes, they admitted, hearings should have been held in 1962, but since they weren't there weren't going to be any hearings now, either!

But pressure from the public continued to grow, and just two weeks before the deadline, Goddard announced that the regulations would be stayed and a hearing held.

#### BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR HOSMER BILL

On Capitol Hill, 23 Congressmen supported a bipartisan bill by Craig Hosmer of California, and Wendell Wyatt of Oregon, to prevent the FDA from putting the regulations into effect. Hosmer said on the floor of the House: "I have been told that there has never been an accidental death due to vitamin overdosage, but it is said that one person dies every three days from taking lethal doses of aspirin, which the FDA permits to go unlabeled."

Months passed, and the FDA kept postponing the hearings. Observers believed that the agency was hoping that its hot potato would cool off. Instead, it got red hot.

Not long before the hearings finally opened, a nutritional survey in New York City showed that of 642 children, 73 per cent were considered to have poor diets, based on the National Research Council's Recommended Dietary Allowances. According to the Bureau of Nutrition of the New York Department of Health, the children had low blood levels of vitamin C, vitamin B<sub>12</sub>, and niacin. Those who were malnourished also suffered significant reading disabilities.

Dr. George Christakis, director of the survey, urged that the children be given vita-

min supplements, a stinging rebuke to the FDA.

A month later, the Citizens' Board of Inquiry into Hunger and Malnutrition in the U.S. released a 100-page report showing that the average American diet does not always provide the recommended daily vitamin-mineral requirements. "Hunger and malnutrition exist in this country, affecting many of our fellow Americans and increasing in severity and extent from year to year," the report declared. Especially among the poverty population, this study found a "high incidence of anemia, growth retardation, protein deficiencies such as marasmus and kwashiorkor and other signs of malnutrition."

A survey done by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1965 revealed that the proportion of "good" diets had decreased from 60 per cent to 50 per cent since the last survey had been made in 1955. The percentage of outright "poor" diets increased from 15 per cent to 21 per cent.

#### FDA TRIES TO "GERRYMANDER" TESTIMONY

In the glare of all this publicity, the vitamin hearings opened on May 7, 1968, to a standing-room-only audience. FDA's first witnesses, hand-picked to argue the agency's case, was Dr. Lloyd Filer, of the American Academy of Pediatrics' Committee on Nutrition. Filer is an expert on infant feeding, and the FDA intended to call upon him to support their labeling requirements for infant formulas. But Filer also happens to be one of the physicians who wrote to the agency in 1966 strongly denouncing the crepe label. The FDA took the gamble that the subject wouldn't come up—and lost.

They lost another gamble too, with Filer. The expert had recently completed a 7-page report on infant feeding. Five of those pages were important to the FDA case. The last two, however, contained a table of "Suggested Allowable Maximal and Minimal Amounts in Mineral and Vitamin Supplements for Infants." These charts recommended generally higher supplement levels than those in the FDA's proposed regulations.

Industry lawyers objected when the FDA attorney tried to introduce only the first five pages of Filer's report. As one lawyer put it, "I don't think the Government has the right to gerrymander the witness's testimony . . ."

Before the day was through, Filer managed to add a personal opinion to the record: "I think it is in restraint of trade that the manufacturer can't make a product claim on the basis of demonstrated effect." In other words, he couldn't see why a manufacturer may not claim that iron supplements prevent iron deficiency "since this is the basis for the inclusion of iron in these products. Clinical studies can be cited to support productive effectiveness."

What about label warning to avoid excessive intake of vitamin D? Filer said he felt that deficiency of the nutrient was a greater danger. To his knowledge, no one has ever died in the United States from an overdose of vitamin D. Too many warnings may frighten people into avoiding vitamin D supplementation altogether, leading to vitamin D deficiencies. And people do become ill and die from that.

#### THE FDA'S "WONDERFUL WITNESS"

Finally, in August of 1968, the FDA managed to get a witness who stuck by its side. He was Arthur Grollman, professor of experimental medicine at the University of Texas' Southwest Medical School. He staunchly defended the regulations as a means of "protecting consumers from wasting their money and buying something they are going to pour out into the sewer." For a while it looked like it was going to be Grollman's show all the way. He curtly brushed off references to a number of authorities holding views conflicting with his own:

Roger J. Williams, Ph.D., biochemical researcher and discoverer of pantothenic acid, who believes that individual differences determine how much of a certain vitamin people need—"Williams' theories are sort of senile ravings. I hate to see my colleague going on like this, not saying anything new, but saying it in such an inflammatory manner to mislead people."

Nobel Prize-winning biochemist, Linus Pauling, Ph.D.—"He is talking through his hat when he advocates large doses of vitamin C to ward off colds. His opinion there is no better than the Governor's." (Governor Ronald Reagan also believes in vitamin C as a preventive for colds.)

Dr. Morris Fishbein, editor of *Medical World News*, and world-famous medical journalist—"He is a well-known publicist." When industry attorney Stewart Land quoted Fishbein as saying the elderly need routine vitamin supplementation, Grollman answered, "I would not hesitate to disagree. Of course, I wouldn't say that it is all hogwash."

When the discussion got around to the crepe label, Grollman protested it was still not strong enough! He called for deletion of the phrase "except for persons with special medical needs." No one, he proclaimed, needs routine supplementation for any reason.

The FDA was positively delighted, but their first big bubble of success was doomed to be burst later that very day. Attorney Stewart Land introduced into the hearing a 1965 paper by Grollman, "Efficacy and Therapeutic Utility of Home Remedies," unpublished, but delivered at the New York Academy of Sciences. Land read from Grollman's paper: "An adequate and varied diet supplies the needed vitamins, but modern processes of refining foods and methods for their preparation often result in removal and destruction of their natural vitamin content." The paper also said that "milder forms of antivitaminosis still occur" and that in such cases, the ingestion of multi-vitamin preparations will prevent the effects of vitamin deficiency." Basically, it was Grollman vs. Grollman, and the winner was the soundness of the regular use of nutritional supplements.

#### FDA'S TOP CONSUMER "EXPERT" UNMASKED

All summer, things went badly for the FDA, and almost in desperation, their attorneys looked forward to October 11, when Sydney Weissenberg, the FDA's Associate Commissioner of Compliance—sort of the agency's police chief—was scheduled to appear. For years Weissenberg had been acting as FDA's official expert on consumer attitudes and opinions. In light of this experience, Commissioners Larrick and Goddard both accepted his assurances that consumers were being misled by vitamin firms. And at his request, they issued the vitamin regulations. Six years of headaches with vitamin regulations were built on Weissenberg's analysis of consumer attitudes towards nutritional supplements.

The day Weissenberg walked into the hearing room to tell all he knew about consumer attitudes, the air was electric. And in short order everyone was shocked speechless—especially Sydney Weissenberg.

The bad news was handed down by hearing examiner David H. Harris. After carefully re-reading the record, he said, he had decided that Weissenberg would not be allowed to testify as an expert on consumer opinions because the record was "entirely barren" of any evidence to show that Weissenberg was qualified as an expert!

He explained: "Weissenberg has not made any attempt to ascertain by survey or direct inquiry attitudes among the general public concerning particular statements involved in the labeling of special dietary foods." Weissenberg's supporters argued that he made many public appearances before consumer groups. Harris labeled them all "public rela-

tions" appearances, not surveys of public opinion.

Weissenberg was totally untrained in interpreting the state of mind of consumers, said Harris. Only people highly trained in that field can offer expert opinion, he said.

It was a major defeat for Weissenberg personally, and a violent blow to the very foundation on which the regulations were built. Weissenberg left crushed, but in two months he was back, armed with new "evidence" to support his regulations.

He introduced a series of hospital nutrition records which he said showed that hospital patients across the country are well nourished. If they don't need vitamins, neither does the rest of the population, he argued.

Somehow, attorney James Johnstone managed to get a copy of Weissenberg's hospital records, and when Weissenberg was finished, the lawyer quietly explained that the Associate Commissioner for Compliance had presented only the records which supported his case. Additional facts in the same records showed many, many cases of nutritional deficiency. Alcoholics and pregnant women particularly showed signs of iron deficiency anemia. They were uniformly treated with dietary supplements.

Then Johnstone introduced other studies, including one by the American Medical Association, which showed that from 10 to 60 per cent of pregnant women suffer from low iron levels. A memo which Johnstone had obtained from FDA investigators, written by a medical official at Chicago's Cook Hospital, said that low income groups often suffer from iron deficiency anemia. A study by the Oklahoma Department of Education's School Lunch Division showed that 30 per cent of school students in all income groups lack adequate iron.

#### A LESSON IN HOW TO MANUFACTURE "EVIDENCE"

Again Weissenberg left in defeat. But he still had one more move. And that was to come up with a "survey" of his own which would prove, without any doubt, that everything he had wanted to say about the gullibility of the American public was true.

Although the survey had been originally commissioned in 1966, the results were not issued to the public until very late in 1972, just a few weeks—by some strange coincidence—before the FDA also released its new dietary regulations. The thrust of the survey results—as interpreted by the FDA—was that the American public is grossly ignorant about its own health and nutrition. Why? Because the majority of us, this survey revealed, think it's a good idea to take nutritional supplements as insurance against vitamin and mineral deficiencies. How's that for a self-serving analysis?

The survey, conducted by a private organization in Philadelphia, also revealed that the more education an individual has, the more likely he is to use nutritional supplements on a regular basis. This fact, the FDA says, means that too much emphasis is placed upon nutrition in college!

Another fact revealed by the survey was that this same group of people—those with college and postgraduate degrees who make regular use of nutritional supplements and health foods—is actually quicker to seek medical attention for persistent symptoms than those who either do not eat health foods, or who only buy them occasionally. Quite clearly, this group of people is not taking supplements in an attempt to out-guess their doctors, or to indulge in self-medication, but rather as a kind of insurance designed to prevent illness.

Significantly, the FDA, in its press release, carefully avoided mentioning this finding, for the simple reason that it blows to

pieces their assertion that people who take vitamins are fuzzy-headed faddists.

It shows, rather, that these people, besides being better educated, are also more concerned about protecting their health and more sensible about seeking medical attention in the face of persisting symptoms.

What it all boils down to is that the FDA, by perverting the survey findings to suit their own prejudices, sought to achieve by a public relations stroke what they could not prove scientifically in two years of testimony at their own hearings.

#### DECISION HANDED DOWN—BY THE PROSECUTION

Finally, in January of this year, the FDA handed down its decision. The food supplements were guilty as charged. Virtually all the restrictions which the FDA had been trying to ram down the public's throat for nearly 10 years were now elevated to the status of law. No more comments. No more discussion. Like it or lump it.

In some details, the FDA compromised on its original proposals. Gone is the requirement for a "crepe label." However, manufacturers are not permitted to state on the labels of their products that the nutrients contained in the package can be of any use whatsoever. It is not even permissible to state that the nutrients can prevent or cure a deficiency state of those very nutrients! The much-attacked "crepe label" was designed to achieve this same goal, so in effect, it is now part of the regulations.

As for the maximum permissible potency, the FDA increased some of them by up to 50 per cent. But vitamins A and D remain at the old RDA level. The point is not whether they should be at the RDA or 2 or 3 times the RDA, but that because vitamins are perfectly safe, except when taken in gigantic overdoses, the FDA has no business at all in dictating how much of them or which kind anyone should take.

In essence, then, the FDA has now made into law everything that it proposed to do before the hearings were held. As taxpayers, we could have saved a lot of money—over a million dollars, in fact—if the FDA had never held the hearings at all.

What is your verdict? Do you think the FDA's decision was reasonable, based on the testimony of the experts? If you do, fine. That is your right. If you don't agree, that is also your right, but the FDA says there is nothing you can do about it.

But there is something you can do. And that is to write your representatives in Washington and let them know how you feel about this miscarriage of justice, misuse of tax money for propaganda purposes, and the theft of your rights as a consumer.

If your Congressman is not aware of the Hosmer Bill, H.R. 643, tell him that you would like to see him become a co-sponsor. This bill would give a sharp tug on the FDA's jurisdictional leash, and prevent it from dictating dietary matters to Americans. This bill is now in the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment. Write to Congressman Paul Rogers, Subcommittee Chairman, in the Rayburn House Office Building, and urge him to have the Hosmer Bill reported out to the floor where it can be acted upon.

It's also a good idea to send a letter to your two U.S. Senators, and urge them to sponsor and support a similar bill.

The FDA is betting that the American public, after all these years of hearings and delays, has been browbeaten into submission. If we are to call their bluff, we must all get busy and deluge our representatives in Washington with letters of protest. Their most important job is to guard against a power grab by the executive branch of the Government, and you can tell them about one of the worst examples of power grabbing in recent history.



## SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

## HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, we are now in the midst of Senior Citizens Month, 1973, a month dedicated to more than 20 million American contributors to the high standard of living we enjoy as a Nation today.

There is an element of tragic irony in celebrating this important month, however, for while we have dedicated it to the millions of older Americans who led our country into the great prosperity we now enjoy, the fact is that the great majority of them have been left on the outside of this prosperity.

I do not believe that a more poignant illustration could be drawn of the situation faced by the citizens we are honoring this month than an illustration drawn by the hand of one so honored. I am, therefore, submitting excerpts from two recent letters of one constituent from Portland, Conn.:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STEELE: I am appreciative of the fact that people from all over the United States are alarmed over our runaway inflation and under the circumstances, I too am very much alarmed because in reviewing my situation I have come up with the following figures, which are self-explanatory:

## Cost of Living 1972

## Base expenses—monthly:

Fuel oil	\$24.00
Electricity	28.00
Telephone	24.00
Garbage collection	2.50
Household insurance	18.33
Real estate tax	77.25
Water	4.25
Maintenance and repair	15.00

Total ----- 193.33

## Basic living cost—monthly:

Food and medicines	150.00
Auto	50.00
CMS/Blue Cross	20.00
Miscellaneous (clothing etc.)	40.00

Total ----- 300.00

Plus monthly ----- 193.33

Total ----- 493.33

## Income:

Social security	194.20
OAA	64.10
Net gain on food stamps	35.10

Total ----- 293.20

Deficit ----- \$200.13

"This is a rough situation. I have been forced to sell assets of extreme sentimental and monetary value principally in the form of furnishings, jewelry and clothing to meet the monthly deficit."

"In spite of the help afforded us through Title 19 (medicaid) many of the doctors whom we have had to use do not participate or will not perform under Title 19, which necessitates our carrying Blue Cross and CMS."

"Mrs. C. was hospitalized three times last year in order to prevent her arm from being amputated. Her total surgical and hospitalization costs since August 15, 1971, have ex-

ceeded \$22,275. My own costs since December of 1971 are in excess of \$18,100. In my case I suffer from Arteriosclerosis which has settled in my legs."

"We are up against the law of diminishing returns. Tax assessment on our home has increased from \$16,000 to \$24,000 although now frozen at the latest assessment. At the rate costs are climbing, we will eventually lose our home and become public charges which will cost both the state and federal government a great deal more money than our present total monthly costs."

"People in my position have, in the past, been browbeaten and frightened into acceptance of being classed as crooks, thieves, supplicants and paupers when asking for the help and which should be given them. If not for humanitarian reasons and compassion for health reasons or for an age which we must all reach in time, but from a plain and sensible economic reason, it is far better to keep people in their own homes whenever possible. Every man and woman should be granted all necessary assistance, financially and from a health standpoint to maintain a reasonable standard of living."

"I respectfully submit that time is inescapable and all of us must face up to it."

"This month I was pleasantly surprised to receive an increase in our food stamp allotment from \$64 to \$92 per month at a total cost of \$30 out of my Old Age Assistance monthly check of \$64.10. No note or letter explanation was included so I have no way of knowing if the increase was intentional, a mistake, temporary or otherwise. I will not inquire and my reasons are as follows:

"1. To qualify for Title 19 assistance I must go into the Welfare Office and submit copies of my Birth Certificate, Marriage Certificate, copies of most recent bank statements, copies of tax, telephone, garbage collection, water, electric, oil, insurance and any other receipts or evidence that I am still Alive and Do, In Fact, require that my Title 19 be continued. This occurs Once a Year."

"2. To qualify for Old Age Assistance I again must go to the Welfare Department and submit the identical documents and go through a searching questioning of each receipt etc., as in No. 1."

"3. To qualify for the Food Stamp program I again must visit the Welfare Department and submit the same documents and information as in 1 and 2 above."

"The dates are not coordinated but occur on dates that I was first certified for such assistance. The only constant is my Social Security which is beyond the reach of the Welfare Politburo."

"On Tuesday, when I took my wife to the doctor who has operated on her arm three times and for which she requires five therapy treatments per week in an effort to restore its use, the doctor discovered that a spinal disc on her right lumbar vertebrae was inflamed and on the point of rupture. This necessitated the purchase of a special corset that same day, which was done at a cost to me of \$40 in cash. The Vendor stated that Title 19 would pay for this if we submitted the proper form, filled in and signed by the Doctor. The form would then go to Hartford and possibly within three weeks we could come in and pick up the corset. Our alternative was to pay out the cash or put her in the hospital which would have cost a minimum \$100 per day. My wife is in agony and now getting therapy on both arm and back with the hope that another operation can be avoided. I called the Welfare Department in reference to my being reimbursed and was advised that I could be repaid the \$40 by having the Vendor submit the forms as above, the Vendor then to collect the money and eventually reimburse me. The Welfare representative warned me, however, that if I did follow the above procedure that the Doctor, the Vendor and myself would be committing an illegal

act. What am I supposed to do? Break the law along with my Doctor and the Vendor?"

"I have always thought in a straight line. All of the present Government Agencies who administer our laws invariably end up with Red Tape, overlapping of efforts and general inefficiency."

Mr. Speaker, those are just a few of the comments from a man whose situation I have grown increasingly familiar with over the last 2 years.

This man was a civil engineer, a professional man. He was a vital member of his community in which he lived and worked for a lifetime. He bought his own home and saved for his retirement.

Today, this man's savings are gone because of catastrophic medical expenses. Today, outrageously high property taxes and soaring inflation eat away at his limited income and tomorrow he is faced with the forced sale of his home. Tomorrow he may become a ward of the State and lose his fight to retain the dignity that he rightfully earned.

This man is one among millions whose life savings have afforded him little, if any, shield against the future—now present and now a reality.

I submit that we assume our responsibilities to the older Americans we are honoring.

In the proclamation announcing May as Senior Citizens Month, the President said:

Government's actions on behalf of older Americans must never become mere caretaking. Rather they must be designed to free and assist senior citizens so that they can remain active and involved, in ways of their own choosing.

Senior Citizens Month is a time to recognize this goal as a responsibility and to begin assigning it the high priority it deserves, but has never had.

CONGRESSMAN WOLFF'S NEWS-  
LETTER TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

## HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep my constituents informed of my work as their Representative in the Congress, I send each family in my district a regular newsletter. At this point in the RECORD, I should like to insert the text of my second report of the 93d Congress:

## WOLFF NEWSLETTER TO CONSTITUENTS

DEAR FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT,

As a primary move in my ongoing efforts to lower food prices, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 6402, to prohibit the exportation of U.S. grains whenever our supply is inadequate to meet at-home needs. I have asked also that this embargo be expanded by Congress to include meats.

I took these actions because I am convinced the time is now to call a halt to foreign grain deals that are creating shortages and inflated prices here at home. The embargo could be lifted when we can afford to ship abroad.

Additionally, I am opposed to the administration's intent to grant the Soviet Union the distinction of Most Favored Nation status, a move aimed only at bailing out

Russia from the \$4 billion she owes us for Lend Lease in World War II. In brief, what Most Favored Nation status means is the Soviet Union will repay the U.S. \$700 million of its war debt and in turn will receive \$700 million in agricultural credits to purchase our wheat and grain. This, too, at a time when foreign nations still owe the United States almost \$46 billion in debts, some dating back as far as World War I.

My Resolution, H. Con. Res. 189, to begin calling in these debts now has gained majority bipartisan support and I am hopeful we can begin collecting what is rightfully owed us. There is no reason why we should persist in being the world's banker when these nations continue to threaten the dollar and our precious gold supply. The \$46 billion owed us would go a long way towards alleviating our domestic ills—to prevent the Administration's massive budget cuts in education, veterans benefits environmental and community action programs.

Other measures I am pursuing, which I believe would lower certain food prices, include an end to the 75 cents a bushel Wheat Tax levied by the U.S. government on the miller and passed on to the consumer. Repeal of this tax—used for promotional purposes—could well result in a drop of two-cents on the retail price of a loaf of bread.

Only through complete and above-board cooperation between government and all levels of the food industry will prices be stabilized and Americans able to eliminate meatless days and sleepless nights.

#### WOLFF PROBES PRICE RISE FROM FARM TO TABLE

I wish I were able to report to you that America's economy is on the upswing, that inflation and cost of living increases were being curbed and that peace prevails. But, I cannot.

While the Administration fumbles over cleaning out the super-sleuths responsible for the Watergate mess, prices continue to soar, unemployment rates remain at an excessively high level and we are committing new American lives to Southeast Asia.

Recently at the Federal Building in New York City, I conducted a four-part series of Ad Hoc Congressional Conferences on food costs with the nation's retailers, wholesalers, producers and farmers, to seek out the underlying causes behind the unprecedented price increases. A great wealth of pertinent and useful information was culled from these meetings with the men of the marketplace who generally concurred that the \$700 million U.S. grain deal with the Soviet Union was the principal reason for the dramatic rise in food prices. Directly affected by these exports are meats—livestock and poultry fattened on grain—and the soaring prices for dairy and bakery products, cereals, cooking fats and oils, and other food staples.

I believe that not only must these exports be halted until we have an adequate supply at home, but this nation must stop paying farmers not to produce food. An agricultural subsidy program that hands out \$4 to \$6 billion each year to keep land idle and non-productive is sheer folly. While the President's program for increased farm production is certainly a step in the right direction, prices never will become stabilized until the basic economic equation of supply and demand is put into proper perspective and balance. To diminish our supplies with excessive exports and inducements not to farm simply accelerates the demand and dictates the rise in both costs and prices.

Last month's meat boycott is a case in point. While it was successful at drawing greater attention to the price crisis, the thrust of the housewives' well intentioned revolt was aimed solely at cutting back demand and did not result in lower prices. Neither did the President's ill-conceived ceiling—imposed on the retail level only—at a time when meat prices were at record highs and suspiciously inflated as though the industry

had had prior knowledge of the impending executive directive.

The answer lies in balancing the scales of supply and demand and in implementing across-the-board price controls on raw agricultural products—the basic link in the food chain.

#### VETERANS' EFFORTS QUICKEN TO ASSURE VA HOSPITAL

In the wake of the Defense Department's edict to shut down St. Alban's Naval Hospital, I have appealed to the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, of which I am the downstate N.Y. member, to amend the VA authorization bill to include funds for a study with the goal of turning the facility into a veterans hospital. I am also asking that the VA be compelled to place a hold on the property to prevent the General Services Administration from selling or releasing it to any other agency.

These proposals have gained a favorable reaction from congressional leaders and I am happy to add that I have received a pledge of "full support" from both Senator Javits and Senator Buckley for my ongoing efforts to save St. Alban's for the future care of Queens and Nassau veterans, Service personnel and their families.

The decision to close down St. Alban's came at the time when Long Island veterans organizations, servicemen and concerned public officials had finally been reassured that the Veterans Administration would take over a portion of the hospital to provide more accessible health and medical care for our nation's former and returning servicemen. The struggle to acquire these facilities had been long and arduous—it now appears the fight is not over.

I am prepared to continue the battle for as long as it takes to successfully resolve the future of St. Alban's for the benefit of our veterans, service personnel and their families who so desperately need these medical care services.

I pledge you my continued commitment to open up new resources to care for these men who have selflessly given so much in the defense of their country.

#### WOLFF BILL TO AID JOBLESS VIETNAM VETS

The Vietnam war has come home and with it the millions of veterans who must now fight to return to the mainstream of America and once again begin to lead enriching and productive lives.

But the going is not easy for these returning servicemen, particularly the untrained and the unskilled, who are finding it increasingly difficult to attain employment. For those wracked with drug addiction, the "cure" today consists of two weeks of detoxification. For the others who do not use drugs, the stigma of suspected use often bars them from gainful employment.

I am attacking these inequities on several fronts. I have introduced legislation (H.R. 6539) to provide tax credits for employers of veterans of the Vietnam war era and I am seeking to establish a new Subcommittee of the House Veterans Affairs Committee to specifically deal with the problems, frustrations and concerns of all Vietnam veterans. Additionally, I have legislation (H.R. 5185) pending to prevent any such callous reduction in disability benefits as was proposed by the Administration.

We must take positive steps to assess the total American sacrifice in this war by offering every available opportunity to our veterans. I find it deplorable that this nation, which demands so much from so many millions, now seems to ignore the basic needs of those most unable to readjust.

#### CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN CONTINUES FOR FORT WORTH FIVE

The perplexing questions surrounding the Justice Department's investigation and incarceration of the Fort Worth Five still re-

main unanswered while five Irish-Americans waste in jail and their families suffer undue hardship.

Recently, I testified before a Judiciary Subcommittee to demand that the Justice Department provide Congress with certain pertinent data concerning this investigation. While the law permits incarceration of recalcitrant witnesses to induce them to answer grand jury questions, clearly this provision is applicable only if investigation is continuing. (No witnesses have been called in the last six months.) If the grand jury has halted or completed its investigation of the Fort Worth Five—and it is this information I seek to ascertain—then these men should not be held any longer under this statute.

The Fort Worth Five, all New Yorkers including Thomas Laffey, a constituent of mine from Williston Park, are in jail in Texas for failing to answer questions of the grand jury investigating alleged gun-running activities to Northern Ireland. Simply, they have refused to testify, even though granted immunity from prosecution here, in fear of possible extradition pursuant to a treaty with Great Britain. Yet, they have not been accused of any crime or wrongdoing and no bail has been set.

I have never presumed to speak of the guilt or innocence of these men—that is for the courts to determine. However, I do strenuously protest the handling of the investigation by the Justice Department. I believe that these men are being treated with less consideration than convicted federal criminals and that their civil rights have been jeopardized. The totally uncooperative attitude adopted by the Justice Department firmly convinces me that Congress should promptly reevaluate the present anti-crime statutes.

#### THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

#### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this year the State of Israel is celebrating its 25th anniversary of founding.

The birth and remarkable growth of the State of Israel is perhaps the outstanding event in the Mideast following World War II. And in making it a dynamic, democratic, and powerful state, the Israeli leaders have worked a near miracle. They have amply proved to the world that the Israeli people are the proud heirs of a most ancient heritage, that of the historic Kingdom of Israel.

Perhaps no other racial or ethnic group has suffered so much and has sacrificed so much of its worldly possessions as have the Jews in their long and turbulent history. I am happy to say that none has earned its richly deserved freedom with more glory as have the Jewish people in their historic homeland.

Since those days of the Kingdom of Israel nearly all Jews lived in dispersion. During that long enforced exile the Jews suffered much. They endured proscriptions, discriminations, and lived under a multitude of inequities in many lands. But they faced their unhappy lot with exemplary fortitude.

Their spiritual and cultural heritage sustained their spirit of freedom and independence during their dispersion.



Through the centuries their rich heritage was kept alive.

Finally, after long centuries of waiting and suspense, many Jews were given the opportunity of returning to their homeland. And in May of 1948, with the proclamation of Israel's independence, they gave birth to the independent existence of the State of Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the close association between the United States and Israel is symbolized by the fact that only 11 minutes after Israel was proclaimed a sovereign state, President Harry S. Truman extended recognition to her.

This Nation was thus the first to recognize the new state. Our affinity with the people of Israel comes from many sources. The American people have a long tradition of sympathy for peoples striving to attain sovereign nationhood. And we Americans harbor a genuine appreciation of the pioneering and courageous spirit that has built Israel.

Against odds considered by many to be insurmountable, the people of Israel have performed an economic and social miracle in this past quarter century.

The State of Israel this year can look back with pride and joy for being a model democratic state in a region known for its dictators while people live in abject misery. The people of Israel are very appreciative of their freedom, of the free institutions which they have created through their own ingenuity and industry, and they are extraordinarily vigilant in guarding their freedom.

Besides building a strong and powerful political state, they have done their utmost in turning the desert of the Negev into a fertile land, and the hills of Galilee into blossoming orchards. By the skillful use of science and the technical abilities of the people, Israel's leaders have transformed arid and inhospitable hills and desert plains into industrial centers and productive farmlands.

Men of vision and wisdom, courage, and confidence developed Israel's economy to its present plateau. This growth has taken place while the nation was surrounded by hostility and enmity.

Israel today stands as a tribute to faith, to courage, to strength, to ingenuity, and to perseverance. The people of Israel deserve the highest praise and the support of all who can appreciate and understand how Israel has achieved the impossible.

The outstanding political, social, and economic achievements of this small, yet determined, nation deserve the admiration of all people who honor the ideals of freedom and respect initiative and courage and resourcefulness.

After 25 years of uneasy and very busy existence, the State of Israel has already earned the right to be recognized as an honorable member of the family of nations.

Under most hazardous circumstances and trying conditions, the State of Israel has progressed steadily at a remarkable pace in the past quarter century.

Despite the multiplicity of difficulties and dilemmas, the people of Israel face their future with increasing confidence and undiminished hope. They carry on the work of the sacred task of making

Israel an ideally viable state, and under their highly educated, dedicated, and intelligent leaders and brave people they carry it on with vigorous zeal and boundless zest.

Mr. Speaker, on the 25th anniversary of the founding of Israel, I wish the Israelis patience and fortitude, peace, prosperity, and happiness in their recreated homeland, and I say "mazel tov," congratulations on the anniversary of their independence.

#### LEGISLATION TO MEDIATE AND ARBITRATE THE CONFLICTING INTERESTS OF THE NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES IN AND TO CERTAIN LANDS

#### HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation providing for the resolution of what has been called "The Greatest Title Problem of the West."

This intertribal dispute is almost 100 years old and the current sensitive, controversial nature of the dispute is, in large part, due to the actions and inactions of the Federal Government. As a consequence, it is my feeling that the Federal Government has an obligation to make provision and to assume a large part of the burden for resolving this issue in a manner most fair and equitable to all parties.

Briefly, the history is this. In 1882 by Executive order, a reservation for the Hopi Indians was created in northern Arizona with the proviso that the Secretary might settle other Indians thereon. The area set aside was approximately 3,990 square miles in area or approximately 2½ million acres. The area was in the middle of the lands which eventually became the Navajo Reservation and, with the passage of time, the Navajos moved into the Hopi Reservation area until the Hopi were located almost solely within a tract of land surrounding their villages in the south of the reservation. Increasing conflict between the two tribes and their members was the result of this encroachment. The problem became very serious. In 1958, in an attempt to solve the problem, the Congress passed a law conferring jurisdiction on a three-judge district court to determine the relative interests of the two tribes in and to the 1882 reservation. Some intended and many believed that this would result in a final settlement of the dispute.

The court, however, in the case of *Haling against Jones*, confirmed in the Hopi Tribe, for their exclusive use, the area surrounding their villages comprised of approximately 650,000 acres. The court then said that they had no jurisdiction to partition the remainder and decided that the balance of the 1882 reservation, surface and subsurface, was in the joint, undivided, and equal ownership of both tribes.

The conflict between the tribes has not only gone on unabated, but has increased.

To add to the complexity of the problem we must resolve, the Hopi were given an undefined interest in a portion of the Navajo Reservation confirmed by the act of June 14, 1934, defining the boundaries of the Navajo Reservation. That act provided that the lands described were for the Navajo and "such other Indians as may already be located thereon." There were, at that time Hopi located in the area and they have some undefined interest which we must, if we are to resolve the issue, define.

Quite obviously, that settlement is best which the parties themselves agree to and accept and which is otherwise in accord with existing law. There have been many attempts in the preceding decades by the parties, sometimes voluntarily and sometimes with the strong urging of the bureaucracy, to negotiate a settlement. These attempts have not only been fruitless, but in some instances, have heightened the conflict.

Mr. Speaker, as some of the Members may recall, the House passed a bill last year seeking to resolve the problem by a legislative partition which met with the reluctant approval of the Hopi and the forthright opposition of the Navajo. In the minds of many people, such a solution will give rise to as many problems for the tribes and the Government as it solves.

Perhaps, in the end, a legislative partition will be the only solution. However, while my optimism is not unlimited, I cannot succumb to the pessimism that a settlement agreeable to the parties is unattainable. I offer this bill as a possible means to achieve that end.

Since I have, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs scheduled hearings on the Hopi-Navajo land dispute for next Monday and Tuesday, I will not go into detail here on the provisions of the bill.

The bill provides for the appointment of a three-man Navajo-Hopi Board of Arbitration. For a 6-month period, the Board will act as a mediator between the parties during negotiations for settlement. Sanctions are provided for the failure of the parties to participate or bargain in good faith. In the event an agreement is reached by the parties during this period, the agreement will, if in accord with existing law, be submitted via the Secretary of the Interior to the Congress. If neither House passes a resolution disapproving the agreement within a certain period, the agreement will have the force and effect of law.

In the event no such agreement is reached, the Board of Arbitration is empowered to formulate a settlement, based upon party offers, the facts, circumstances, and the law, which shall be submitted to the Congress in a similar fashion.

The bill makes provision for the consideration of ancillary problems and authorizes appropriations to facilitate the settlement of the problem.

As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs will have hearings next week on this problem. We

will take testimony from the two parties and from the administration. We will be considering H.R. 5467, introduced by Mr. STEIGER of Arizona; the bill I have just introduced; and any other pertinent legislation then pending.

MARY McGRORY—A RARE TALENT

## HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, truth today is a precious commodity—eloquence of phrase almost a lost art—courage to speak—the skill to do so with both candor and eloquence a rare gift.

Mary McGrory demonstrates a rarity of talent, a strength of courage and a precision of speech commanding all who will read her words a measure of attention and deserved applause.

I commend her words that follow to the attention of all my colleagues in the House:

[From the Evening Star and Daily News, May 8, 1973]

TIME TO SOUND THE BUGLE CALL?

(By Mary McGrory)

What Gen. Alexander Haig, President Nixon's new chief of staff, might do is to sound the bugle for some "whiskey-drinking, poker-playing, evil old men" to fill the decimated ranks of the White House staff.

The President has hinted that all polls are cads in the crunch—and his own record is compelling evidence on the point—but what most politicians have that was never exhibited by the clean-living Pharisees who served Nixon was a sense of limits.

They will do almost anything to get elected, but even a ward-heeler would have balked at forging cables in the name of a dead president.

An honest rogue might have suggested caution in approaching the judge with a job offer in the middle of the Pentagon papers trial.

"It wouldn't look right if it got out," he might have murmured.

Some things are sacred to the housebroken politician. J. Edgar Hoover, for instance. But the late director was apparently inveigled into giving his approval for a White House "investigation" of Daniel Ellsberg—an investigation that should have been done by the FBI.

The old man, it has been said hereabouts recently, would never have been lured into the trap that closed on his successor, L. Patrick Gray, who blindly accepted an order to conduct a patsy probe of the Watergate.

Gray was compromised, gangster-style, we have since learned. They have something on him. He burned "hot" documents passed to him in the White House by John Dean and John Ehrlichman.

In 1971, Hoover may have been compromised himself. The White House had indulged his cry for the blood of the Berrigan brothers and their friends.

So presumably the old man gave way in his turn. And the White House was literally turned into a den of thieves, something that might have shamed an old precinct worker, especially while prayer meetings were being held so ostentatiously under the same roof.

Gov. Ronald Reagan offered the thought that the men around the President were not "criminals at heart." That may be true. They

were something more dangerous to a Republic. They were barbarians.

They seized the government the way the Vandals fell on Rome. They sacked and pillaged it. They tore down the temples and smashed the statues. Nothing they had not done themselves had any value. No institution, no tradition, no idea beyond power, had any meaning.

They treated the FBI like a private detective agency. They made a mockery of the Justice Department. They used the CIA as a wardrobe and camera-supply house. It is against the law for the CIA to conduct domestic operations. But for the men who wore the flag in their lapels while exhorting those who burned it, there were no laws.

Now the Marine Corps, another symbol of incorruptibility, has been dragged in. Its commandant, Gen. Robert Cushman, when he was deputy director of the CIA, gave the White House all it asked in the way of masks and wigs and false papers, "safe" houses and "sterile" phone numbers when the burglary of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist was being plotted in the Executive Mansion.

"Semper Fidelis" is the motto of the corps. Cushman had served the President as a military aide, and he knew the terrain. Fidelity to the president is all that counts.

Seemliness is still eluding the men around the President, and, for that matter, the President himself. H. R. Haldeman and Ehrlichman rode to the grand jury in White House cars. It was a touch of bravado perhaps. They once owned the government, they still command its trappings. It does not cross their minds that people might be offended by the cavalier use of public property at a moment when their abuse of public trust was being attested to in courthouse a continent apart.

The emperor who presided over the most massive heist in the history of the republic—the national honor—is sitting in the ruins, issuing new decrees about executive privilege and new denials of his knowledge of what went on at his door and in his name.

Any self-respecting politician would have long since resigned.

## TO HONOR OUR ELDERLY

## HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to say a word about our elderly. This, as I am sure you know, is Senior Citizens' Month, a special time to honor our older people.

I, for one, applaud the efforts of this Congress in the passage of the Older Americans Act Amendments in April. This is certainly a step in the right direction, and will assist our elderly where they need it the most, at the community, even the neighborhood level.

It is this community togetherness which I would like to emphasize. Our senior citizens are the backbone, the foundation of our society. And no matter how superficially youth-oriented our culture becomes, we should never forget this. Speaking of youth, I am reminded of a comment made by our eminent anthropologist, Dr. Margret Mead. She said that our youth are afraid to grow up, afraid of death, because our elderly are taken away from the living and evolving family process; the young do not have

the opportunity to communicate to these older people.

I think more togetherness between old and young would benefit all people. I know of foster grandparent programs and retired senior volunteer programs where the elderly initiate contact with younger groups of children, especially orphans or foster children or youngsters in hospitals. Programs like these give the elderly a purpose, and a vehicle to communicate with the young. There are many unwanted youngsters in this country, I am sorry to say. And, there are also many unwanted oldsters.

I do not believe the parceling out of an older person into a retirement home is necessarily the answer either for them or for us. Certainly, we can say that when our elder relatives are in a retirement home, they will be with their peers, and therefore much happier. But this is not always true.

One never stops growing. What would a child do without older people to guide him? In the same way, a younger person can open the eyes of an older person. I think it would be a wonderful idea if more youngsters and youth groups actively participated in getting acquainted with the elderly of their towns and cities. The joy of communication does not run just one way, I assure you. I believe our country can use the resources of each and every individual no matter how old or how young. Our communities were envisioned to be a mixture of all, old people and young people. Webster's dictionary defined a community as "a social group of any size whose members reside in a specific locality, share government, and have a cultural and historical heritage." How can we have any heritage at all if we segregate our elderly?

All over this great land of ours, citizens are complaining about the lack of community, the lack of caring in our towns and cities. Maybe one reason is because we are not utilizing the experience and wisdom of all our human resources, particularly our elderly. Marshall MacLuhan says—

A Community in which the elderly do not play an integral and central role is not really a community at all.

I feel, when all is said and done, that to honor our senior citizens by naming a month for them is not enough; we need to involve ourselves with our elderly, and allow them to involve themselves with us. This is real community, and the true sharing of our humanity and our heritage. Our elderly have lived where we have not, have lived when we have not; they can teach us much. And we should begin to listen.

GEORGE FOREMAN

## HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, George Foreman, ex-Jobs Corpsman from Houston, Tex., did what others



thought he could not do—George beat Joe Frazier and became world heavyweight boxing champion on January 23, 1973. I remember well that night in Jamaica.

George Foreman eloquently told his story in the article, "Don't Knock the American System to Me" and after reading it, I want to share this testimonial with my colleagues. The opportunity will exist in America for success and personal, satisfying accomplishments. With hard work and dedication, George Foreman made a dream come true. He believes in America and after reading his story, your faith will also be restored.

The article follows:

**DON'T KNOCK THE AMERICAN SYSTEM TO ME!**

(By George Foreman)

In my business, boxing, I know a lot about giving hard knocks, and getting them, too. That's the kind of business it is. I accept it for being that. But knocking the American system, that I can't take.

If there is give and take in life, and I know for sure there is, and some of it rough stuff, a man has to find out early in his life how much of each he has capacity for.

I found out early, though, that you don't get much of anywhere by knocking success. The really smart guy tries to find out why it works, and how he can get in that kind of action, and then tries to make it work for him.

They call me a flag-waver, and it's true. Not just that time in Mexico City in the Arena Mexicana on the night of Oct. 27, 1968. That was when I had beaten the Soviet heavyweight, Leonid Chepul's. The referee called it a TKO, and the Olympic gold medal was mine.

There were more than 2,000 black athletes in these Olympic Games in all sports. I was afraid—even with the USA on my jersey—they might not know I was an American. And I wanted everybody to know, and to know that at that moment I was one of the happiest Americans who ever lived. So, I took the little American flag from the pocket of my robe, and waved it as I took a bow to each of the ring's four corners.

What never occurred to me then was that this little thing I did would be translated into an opposing view to the "black power" fever which was so much a part of that Olympics. It wasn't that at all. If that other way was how John Carlos and Tommy Smith felt—well, the America I came from is a free country, and they were entitled to do or say what they felt or thought. I was so proud, I was just doing what came naturally to me. It was my "thing," and thank God, it is still my "thing."

Casting about for places to put blame for the troubles a person has is an old human trait. "They" is an easier word to use than "I," when things don't go right. But in getting by an obstacle, or a trouble, or a problem, the key—and I know this because I've had them all, and still have some—is to take after it, all alone if that's the only way.

More times than not, battles have to be taken on alone. The messes a man gets into, they're the same. They didn't hunt him up; he went looking for them, whether he always knew it or not. He has to get into them himself, even if he has company at the time.

Nobody got me down in the street, for example, held my nose, and poured cheap wine down my throat when I was a kid. Not at all. I got the bottle, tipped it up, and drank it. Who would believe me if I said somebody forced me to drink that stuff? I don't force that easy. The memory of that wine is so clear to me yet that the smell of it now makes me sick to my stomach.

And when I was going about my first

record-setting—which was how many windows I could break in a row without getting caught—I can't lay that idea on anybody else's doorstep. It was all my own, and I got all the way up to 200 before the Houston police thought it just might be me and looked me up to talk about it. It was quite a record, if one just wanted to look at the size of it, but it wasn't sensible or respectable to do it.

These were things that happened when I thought I had nothing going for me, but it was mostly my own attitude toward life that made it so. There was the high school there in the bloody Fifth Ward of Houston, and I dropped out of it in the ninth grade. It was my decision, not the school's. That and the other things caused my mother—bless her for all the suffering she endured for me—to have a nervous breakdown. That was my decision, being a bad guy and causing it, not hers. I had about lost faith in everything before I was even started, I guess, but she never lost faith in me.

#### SEEING THE LIGHT

Then, like Paul on the way to Damascus in the Bible story, my vision cleared up and the time came to make a right decision. I did it.

It was in an unlikely place, a Houston pool hall, and the TV set was on.

The man on the tube was doing one of those public service spots. It's a part of America that when a man gets famous, is a celebrity, they ask him to do these commercials about all kinds of things. Some are for causes, like fighting cancer, or helping retarded kids. This guy was recruiting, and he was saying he was once a down-and-outter himself.

Boy, was he on my wavelength, talking my language! I listened to him, half-like at first, and then he said he had this one skill, and finally got a chance to use it, and made it big. To anybody listening who needed a skill to get a job, he said, why not give the Job Corps a try?

So, I laid down that pool cue, and picked up hope. That's for me, I told myself, and they took me. There was some money in it, \$30 a month, and \$50 to go in the bank, and they'd send some home to my mother. Did she ever need it then!

It wasn't until then that it began to come to me what America was really all about, how there were things being done to really try to help people such as me find some way out. I was first in a Job Corps Center in Oregon, and then went to a big one, the Parks Job Corps Center, near Pleasanton in California.

It had a big company running it, Litton Industries. How come? Well, they were used to bringing people in through their employment offices and then teaching them whatever skill was needed for them to make or manufacture something. People just don't come off the street ready-made to do such work, they have to be taught. At Parks, they had courses in business machine repair, in electronics, auto mechanics, building maintenance and custodial services and how to cook. They put me in electronics, and had me putting transistor radios together.

But I was a rambunctious teenager, full of vinegar, and thought I was a pretty tough guy. Liked to fight, anywhere, anybody, the whole thing. But that wasn't the kind of place it was; it wasn't any western copy of my old Fifth Ward slum back in Houston. R. Sargent Shriver, the head of this war on poverty agency—Office of Economic Opportunity—he was telling the centers to throw the troublemakers out. I was headed out, no question about that, and to be honest about it, I didn't care all that much.

Litton Industries had put a man in there as the center director, Dr. Stephen Usian, a fine man. When he was getting all this advice from his staff to send me packing, he said No. He said I was the kind of material

the center had been set up to deal with. It wouldn't solve anything, he told them, just throwing George Foreman out. I had been thrown out of a lot of things by then, and it hadn't impressed or improved me much, was the way he put it. And then, he said the words which really turned George Foreman around.

"If he likes to fight so much," he told those staff guys, "put him in the ring down in the rec hall, and let him get it out of his system that way."

In business, you see, they can't really stand it when something won't work. They try one way, and then another, and they keep trying until they find the combination. Litton was especially good about things never tried before, and they had the guts to give it another try, and they took another swing at the George Foreman problem.

And then I found out what a long way it is from just an idea to a real, accomplished dream. I hit a lot of people, and I was awkward. I found out if I could connect, I could jolt them. I knew that, but also that I needed a lot of honing. I must have been the dullest knife in town.

But there are professionals in everything who know how to mold people, and Litton had one of them in that rec hall. His name was, and is, Charles R. "Doc" Broadus. They hadn't just hired a man and sent him down there to work in the rec hall when they got Doc. He had been in this boxing thing for 35 years or more. If I would listen to him and follow his instructions, he said, he'd get me into Golden Gloves, and maybe on the Olympic team, and then I could turn pro. He said that he thought I could be champion one day, but that I would have to make up my mind to work for it.

Now down there in Houston in the slum I came from, there wasn't too much talk about working for anything. People got money a lot of the time from being what was called smart—or from taking advantage of somebody. People walked on both sides of the line, as far as the law was concerned. But Doc said I could get it all, everything that went with it, if I was willing to work for it.

#### A BIG FOUR-LETTER WORD

Work is such a big four-letter word. I'd known a lot of the other four-letter words and they couldn't help anybody. This one meant sweat. It meant getting banged around. It meant being more tired than I had ever been in my life. And sore in more places, too. But when I went into Golden Gloves, I found it paid off, and I won. Then there were the Olympic trials in Toledo, Ohio, and by a hair, I made the Olympic team. Litton sent Doc Broadus and one of its executives, a onetime Air Force colonel, Barney Oldfield, down to Mexico City with me.

What I didn't know then was that as early as June, 1968 (the Olympics were in October), Barney had written to several friends of his, sportswriters, people like that, telling them to interview me in Mexico City because, he said: "George Foreman will win the gold medal, and go on to be heavyweight champion of the world."

It meant a lot to me, finding out such things, and that work was getting me closer and closer to where I wanted to be in life, and that other people were believing in me, other than my mother. And because I like kids, I found the ones who lived in slums as I had and others, too, were beginning to hang around me. They wanted to talk to me and they were paying attention to what I said. The more I won, the more they tuned me in. What a difference it makes when you first have that feeling that people are looking up to you, and not down on you!

That night after winning in Mexico City, I couldn't bear to take the gold medal from around my neck. It was my badge, my reminder. The ones around me now had been

telling me the truth: Work and get with it, and you can have it all.

I had put a phone call in to my mother in Houston. She was always worrying about me getting hurt. Not the other guy, just me, her little boy, all 220 pounds of him. But I felt a desperate need to talk to her, to tell her that finally all those young boy kitchen conversations and dreams we used to have were starting to come true.

While I was talking with her, Barney waited, and when I came back to the table, he said that if it was all right with me, he was going to call the White House in Washington. He was going to remind them that this George Foreman who won in Mexico City was a Job Corpsman.

It was a program President Lyndon B. Johnson had brought about himself, and now he would surely want to see me and tell me himself how proud he was. Imagine! "Man, you're too much," I told Barney.

On Nov. 18, 1968—just three weeks later—Charles B. "Tex" Thornton, Litton's board chairman; Eugene Allen, of the Parks Job Corps Center; Barney and myself, we were walking up to the White House on our way to visit the President of the United States!

#### A GIFT TO THE PRESIDENT

I was carrying a little plaque I wanted to give him. I didn't know whether it was the right thing to be doing or not, but almost every time I saw pictures of him, he was giving something to somebody. I felt I owed him something. I was about to learn that whatever your heart tells you to do is always right, never wrong.

When I gave it to President Johnson, he looked so tired. The whole country kind of had him on the ropes then. To bring it back together, he'd made the big decision not to be their punching bag any more. I told him the plaque was to thank him for making the Job Corps possible—giving young Americans such as me a chance for hope, and dignity and self-respect. I saw a tear start down his cheek from his left eye. But he was sharp, too. Recovering himself, and waving the plaque at the press who were there in his Oval Office with us, he told them he was going to keep it there where they could see it everytime they came in, to let 'em know there was one person in the world who thought he had done something right!

I learned a lot about America that day: That when you're right, and do right in a big way, even the President of the United States will have you in to tell about it, and encourage you to keep on, now that you've found out what it's like. And I was standing there with him, and he had once been poor, too, and was a not-too-well-educated Texas boy who had refused many times along the way to be licked. He was going out of that White House, a man who had championed the cause of a lot of people, including me, and however bad he may have felt, I knew he could live with himself for all he had done.

Tex Thornton said he was proud of me, the way it had gone there in the White House, and he said he would always be available to me for any advice I might need, that I had only to ask. He even said he and some of his friends would put together a kind of syndicate, or association, which would back me and keep me from having to take any offers which might not be good for me in the long run. When I told him I wanted to try it alone, he respected that, and understood it, and accepted it.

Somewhere, I kept telling myself, I have to begin making my own decisions, and it might as well be now. The professional thing was on my mind, and I talked with Dick Sadler about being my manager-trainer. He had had a long string of champions the last being Sonny Liston. I had a strong feeling and admiration, for Sonny. He had had so

far to come back when he started, from the hole he was in, and he did it. He came to a sad end, but in what he did, he showed all things were possible.

[Sonny Liston, who had many scrapes with the law during his life, was found dead in his Las Vegas, Nev., home in January, 1971. He had been dead for about a week. Drugs were at the scene, but the death was attributed officially to natural causes.]

Work! That word again, Dick Sadler told me about how much of it I had to take on now. He said the road ahead was bumpy, and had turns in it, lots of them. There were some places we fought in where we almost had to borrow money, or hock something, to get out of town. We had trouble getting opponents. Boxing writers were saying I fought Joe Namelesses and Bill Whozitses, and that I had to get more experience, when I couldn't get most of the ones I fought to stand up long enough to give me any. All this was what Dick Sadler had meant by work, that it could include frustration and hopelessness and fighting off giving in to them. There was word to split. And at 6:30 in the morning, running those three-mile exercises when other people were still asleep. Then the gym, the bag—the little one and the big one—over and over.

#### A FINANCIAL CRISIS

I was hurting for money. I wanted to get married to Adrienne, a pretty girl I knew. A guy can't be smart enough to dodge everything. I signed some papers with some people, and I got married early in 1972 and we were very happy. Then the big chance came, and I signed for the fight with Joe Frazier for the championship in Jamaica. Right then, everything went sour in my mouth. I found that in the fight business, it's not just yourself, the guy you're fighting, and the referee in there with you—in spite of everything you try to do, you pick up partners, people who share in you, who know how to play you and your desires, and they have more to say about you than they should. When you have been living from day to day all your life, the implications of what you sign today don't look as big as they will tomorrow.

I got caught up in one of these things, not the first fighter to have it happen to him nor probably the last. But it upset me so, the only thing I could think of was quitting the ring. I meant it. The lawyers all gathered around me and begged me to go ahead; suits were filed, and finally, in a kind of desperation, they asked me if I had a friend somewhere that I trusted. They wanted to explain it all to him, they said, and then he could advise me. I remembered Litton Industries, and told them to call Barney Oldfield. It was 3 o'clock in the morning in California when he got the call from New York, and after bringing him up out of a deep sleep, they talked with him for a half hour or more.

The next day, he called me.

I told him I didn't want to fight Joe Frazier, even if I knew I could beat him. So many people had gotten their hands into my money, I didn't want to be another sad story in boxing for people to write about. I said I might as well forget the whole thing.

But Barney told me: "George, the only thing I figure you can do is go knock Joe Frazier out, and then come back and show people you can take all this. If you don't go ahead with the fight, they'll all be writing you're scared or something." He said it was a legal contract, and the important thing was to win the title and then argue.

Suddenly, it all cleared up for me. I was really fighting everybody but Joe Frazier, and he was the one to beat. "They" didn't mean anything. It was just the same old "they" to blame things on again, and I was beyond that. I had to be. What I was in was a business, and I had to treat it like a business, where contracts were contracts, and if

I didn't have integrity about a contract, however bad it might be, what would I have left?

It was off to Jamaica, even though my wife, Adrienne, was pregnant, and the baby was due. On Jan. 6, there in Kingston, I heard that my baby girl, Michi Helene, had been born in far off Minneapolis. On Jan. 10, I became 24 years old. On Jan. 22, after a minute and a half of the second round and when he had been knocked down six times by me, Joe Frazier—the favorite of almost every boxing writer and odds-maker in the world—had lost his heavyweight crown, and it was mine! Bad as I had felt about not being able to be with my wife when our baby came, it was one of the things life asks of you in keeping things in focus, and I could now get home to them—a champion.

#### GIVING THANKS

In the delirium of the ring, I guess I thought of everyone—the ones who believed in me and had done things for me.

Among them was Johnny Unitas, the famous pro football quarterback, the one who had done the public service TV spot about the Job Corps which sent me off in this new direction.

I didn't know until after the fight that President Johnson had died while I was on the way to the stadium. They kept it from me. It gave me a chill to think back to that day in 1968, when, there in the White House, he had asked me when I thought I'd be heavyweight champion, and I said I didn't know. It made me sad to think he couldn't have lived one more day and read about what had happened in Jamaica that night. Without the Job Corps, I wouldn't have been there.

So, don't talk down the American system to me. I know what men go through to make it run. I also know that some of its rewards can be there for anybody, if he will make up his mind, bend his back, lean hard into his chores and refuse to allow anything to defeat him.

The first thing I did in my dressing room that night after the fight in Jamaica was close the door, with Doc Broadus and Barney Oldfield in there with me. I went down to the foot of the old training table, got down on my knees, and thanked my God—for everything, for everybody, and for the determination He gave me to see it through. Perhaps there are several who deserve as much as I do to be champion, and perhaps they, too, will have their chance, but none can feel any more fortunate than I do to hold the title while I can.

I can truly say I worked for it. I say, worship the opportunity this country grants to those who will really try, don't knock it.

I'll wave that flag in every public place I can.

#### H.R. 982 TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that an assignment by the Foreign Affairs Committee made it necessary for me to be out of the country on the day H.R. 982 was considered by the House.

I am deeply concerned by the problems that have arisen because of the large number of aliens who have entered this country illegally or violated their terms of entry. Since I did not hear the debate on H.R. 982, I do not know if that measure would provide any meaningful relief from the illegal alien problem. Therefore,



I cannot say positively whether I would have voted for the bill.

As I understand it, H.R. 982 proposed, in section 1, to remove an inequity that exists with respect to Western Hemisphere aliens now in this country who wish to change their alien status to that of permanent resident aliens. It would be hard to oppose this provision in light of the fact the aliens from the Eastern Hemisphere can, under existing law, effect such a change of status without the requirement that they leave and reenter the country, a requirement that applies under present law to aliens from the Western Hemisphere.

Section 2 of H.R. 982 proposes procedures under which penalties can be assessed against employers or their agents who knowingly hire aliens who have entered the country illegally, or who have entered legally but do not have the necessary clearance for entering the work force.

As a member of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have participated in hearings that seek to identify managerial and operational weaknesses in the Immigration and Naturalization Service that might have contributed to the vastly increased numbers of aliens who have entered or remained in the United States in an illegal status in the past 10 years. The statistics are overwhelming. The jurisdiction of our committee is, of course, limited under the rules of the House, to matters relating to the economy and efficiency of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. We cannot legislate in the area of controlling the influx of aliens; we can only make recommendations relating to management and operational problems of the Service. However, in fulfilling our specific responsibilities, our subcommittee has been made abundantly aware of what has come to be known as the illegal alien problem.

The illegal alien problem can take many forms. We know for a fact that aliens have, without legal documents and required examinations, slipped over the borders from Mexico and Canada, and through ports on the Atlantic, Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico, and through international airports. Once here, they have entered the labor market without right to do so; all too often they have been hired at substandard wages and worked excessively long hours by unprincipled employers who quickly learn of their illegal status. If these workers are accounted for at all under Internal Revenue laws, they make excessive dependency claims and underpay their taxes. We have reports of employers who, on the day before payday, report the presence of such aliens, who are removed by enforcement authorities and put through deportation procedures before they can collect their pay. If H.R. 982 does anything to halt these deplorable practices, then it is good legislation and worthy of my vote.

Suppose the alien cannot find employment. Welfare authorities usually look at need rather than entitlement and provide these unfortunates with food, clothing, shelter and medical care, all at taxpayer expense.

In contemplating such cases as these which I describe, we often think of the injustice done legal members of the workforce with whom the illegal aliens compete for jobs. We think of the overburdened taxpayers, who must pay increasing amounts for enforcing the immigration laws, and the expenses of detaining and expelling illegal aliens, and pay the costs of unentitled public services.

But this is not the whole picture. There is the humanitarian consideration of impoverished individuals in other countries who, lacking the opportunity to support himself and his family, risks an illegal entry to this country and exposes himself to ultimate arrest and imprisonment until such time as he can be deported—all for the sake of being exploited by an employer looking to save a dollar in labor costs. If H.R. 982 speaks to such employers in terms of sure and heavy penalties for exploiting foreign nationals, then it is a good bill.

There is also the matter of the alien who is here legally, and possessing the necessary certification for entering the labor market. His own integrity and honor, as a legal immigrant, are threatened by the tactics of those who would come here without the required legal formalities. If H.R. 982 will protect legal immigrants from such indignities, it is a good bill.

It is a sad thing that, to some persons in the lower economic strata of some foreign countries, slave labor or living on relief in the United States is more attractive than scratching out a living in their native lands. A part of this attractiveness arises from the willingness of some unscrupulous employers in this country to provide slave labor opportunities. If H.R. 982 will correct this deplorable condition, then it is a good bill.

#### PREDISASTER ASSISTANCE FOR ALAMEDA AND CONTRA COSTA COUNTIES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today legislation which would require the President to furnish predisaster assistance in order to avert or lessen the effects of a major disaster in the counties of Alameda and Contra Costa. These areas face a grave and widespread danger of fire due to the death of thousands of eucalyptus trees which were killed in a severe freeze last December.

Because these trees continually shed their bark and leaves, they build up a "duff" on the floor of the forest. Since the freeze, the duff has, in some areas, become as deep as 12 to 18 inches. This amounts to roughly 50 tons of highly combustible material per acre in some places.

This poses a fire hazard so great that a major disaster would be the only way to describe such an event once it had occurred. Unfortunately, the Office of

Emergency Preparedness has, in the past, interpreted the "predisaster" section of the Federal Disaster Law to mean that a threat of disaster must be reasonably certain to occur within a week of the formal request for assistance in order to qualify as "imminent" under the language of the statute. The rigid interpretation requiring that such a disaster be only a week or less away, is overly and in my view, unnecessarily restrictive in a situation such as this.

I urge that, in view of the need to avert a disaster of tremendous proportions, action be taken immediately on this bill:

H.R.—

A bill to require the President to furnish predisaster assistance in order to avert or lessen the effects of a major disaster in the counties of Alameda and Contra Costa in California

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

#### FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress finds and declares that a freeze in December of 1972 killed tens of thousands of eucalyptus trees in the counties of Alameda and Contra Costa in California, that such trees are highly combustible and threaten to cause a major disaster, that State and local resources are strained to the point where all available funds are being expended, and that immediate Federal assistance is necessary to avert or lessen the effects of such a disaster.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized and directed:

(1) to make grants to units of local government and State and local public agencies in order to assist such units and agencies; and

(2) to reimburse them for assistance furnished prior to the date of enactment of this Act,

for the purpose of carrying out fire suppression, tree removal, and reforestation activities on public and private lands located in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties in California in connection with the threatened major disaster referred to in section 1. The amount of any grant under this section may not exceed the cost actually incurred by the grantee in carrying out such activities. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$11 million dollars to carry out the provisions of this section. Any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

#### FEDERAL RESOURCES

SEC. 3. The President shall exercise the authority conferred on him by section 221 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to assist units of local government and State and local public agencies in carrying out fire suppression, tree removal, and reforestation activities on public and private lands located in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties in California to avert or lessen the effects of the threatened major disaster referred to in section 1.

#### QUALITY IN LIFE: AN ELUSIVE BUT REAL VALUE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in our modern day of almost constant and rapid change fueled by unprecedented techno-

logical discoveries and economic growth, modern man seemingly seldom has the time or takes the time to pause and reflect on the purpose and the meaning of his actions and existence. More than ever before, man seems to be preoccupied with what he is doing rather than why he is doing something.

In a recent issue of the Marquette Tribune, a weekly newspaper published and edited by students of Marquette University of Milwaukee, Wis., members of the Marquette community were invited to comment on the unique role which the university can, does, or should play in helping man preserve the quality of life in our modern society.

A reading of the following three articles which appeared in the March 28 issue of the Tribune demonstrates that, as elusive as the quest for quality in life is, there is a common desire shared alike by university administrators, faculty members, and students at Marquette University to promote the development of a God-centered, human value-oriented society.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I insert the three articles into the RECORD, calling them to the attention of our colleagues:

**STUDENTS HERE IMPELLED TO "SEARCH FOR TRUTH"**

(By Rev. John P. Raynor, S.J.,  
University President)

I was pleased when the Tribune asked me to prepare a brief article highlighting my "impressions of the future" of Marquette University. All of higher education is much concerned about the future; Marquette University is no exception. We must be constantly alert to ways and means of enhancing Marquette's strength, of eliminating or ameliorating its weaknesses, of improving it in every possible way as we look to our centennial, now just a few years away, and on into the 21st century.

But reflections on the future must be predicated upon a good grasp of the past and upon a sound understanding of the present. Both show elements of which Marquette may be proud—elements on which a promising future may be firmly based. I speak here of the very concept of Jesuit higher education, which antedates Marquette's opening in 1881 by hundreds of years. The concern for the "whole man" has been central to Jesuit education ever since the beginning of our first school at Messina nearly 400 years ago. It is central to our existence today. It will be at the crux of Marquette a hundred years from now.

Jesuit higher education does something beyond assisting its students to become skilled scientists, engineers, journalists, teachers, dentists, accountants, or any one of the dozens of professions for which they seek education here. Marquette wants also to mold the knowledge, attitudes and values of students so that they may solve problems in terms of real human consideration, so that they may convert thought to action in a God-centered, value oriented context. If Marquette impels a student in his search for truth, perhaps the search will continue until that student meets Truth itself.

This is the thrust that has had centrality in all of Jesuit higher education; it is the philosophy embraced by the Jesuits and lay people who are now setting the course on which Marquette will embrace the same philosophy in the future.

Our philosophy transcends the more immediate concerns: the financial crunch, curriculum revision, building buildings, adjusting to changing life styles, soliciting funds, guiding meaningful research and improving

service to the community. Moreover, within this context everything we have done or will do by way of improving our academic and educational programs, recruiting and promoting personnel, improving the physical aspects of our campus, strengthening our professional education and our service through the professional schools, we do with the immediate objective of improving our commitment to scholarship, our dedication to truth and our concern for values in action.

We want to share our scholarship with young people; to share with them our insights into reality, of God, of nature, of men, and of all these things in full measure.

We have, especially in recent years, involved ourselves in on-going self-analysis in order to reach a good self-understanding with which to address the future. Faculty, administrators and students have been involved in the reflection and dialogue out of which has come a self-realization from which we can build a strong and truly relevant Marquette University—a University which moves ahead enthusiastically because it knows what it should be and where it should go.

A practical course of action demands that Marquette's future development be predicated upon adequate financing. As the profile we prepared for our North Central visitation indicates, very rare is the institution today—Independent or tax supported—which is immune to dollar problems. Independent institutions like Marquette have particular challenges because they must depend so heavily upon tuition revenues. The increase in tuition and fees relate directly to enrollments and to the general inflationary cycle, and such cost escalations are difficult to control.

The profile also points out that the financial problems of the University directly affect the Marquette student, since tuition revenues account for only slightly more than half of Marquette's operating budget. Tuition rates have had to be increased because of inflationary pressure and because of our pledge to provide continued quality education for our students. We are working hard to extend our base of support, not only to retain and improve our excellent standing in higher education, but also to reach a point where student fees can be stabilized.

On the physical side of our assessment, it is easy to see the progress Marquette has made since the mid-60s. Before urban renewal, Marquette's campus included a variety of clusters in an ill-defined setting. We have seen an orderly and efficient grouping of structures emerge and a true campus become a reality. Moreover, renovations such as those in the Dental School and in Sensenbrenner Hall (Law School), have enabled us to improve academic progress in these areas.

Physical improvement is much in evidence on the campus and must continue for a few more years, but hopefully we are within sight of a downturn in capital expenditures which, in the not too distant future, may permit greater use of gift income for operating purposes and to strengthen further our academic offerings.

The new elements at Marquette, including some of our advance degree programs, undergraduate course improvements, student financial aids and buildings, have come by way of what the Greater Marquette Program started in the early 60s, and what "Advance" stimulated in the late 60s, and what "Advance II" hopes to accomplish by early 1974. Since the Greater Marquette Program started in 1962, almost \$35,000,000 in voluntary, private support has been raised or pledged for improvements in the academic and physical environment.

"Advance II" is the closing segment of our current fund raising campaign. Marquette had attracted \$18,000,000 in "Advance" support by last fall, when "Advance II" was in-

tiated to obtain the remaining \$12,000,000 toward the ultimate goal of \$30,000,000 by early 1974. We still have more than \$10,000,000 to go, a fund raising pace never attained before in the University's history.

The pace is important not merely to meet a goal, but to respond to a reasonable challenge to obtain for Marquette students the people and programs the University has determined as essential to sustain and improve its total academic enterprise. And we are all grateful to the friends, alumni and benefactors who have helped us achieve our goals, and who have indicated their willingness to stand with us as we move forward.

While financing is a major problem, there are others to be faced. Today, within the context of the national educational community, Marquette is one of many hundreds of colleges and universities grappling with the consequences of significant changes in the public's attitude toward post-secondary education. For many reasons, certainly with cost of education high among them, the proportion of the college student population attending independent colleges and universities has declined constantly since the early 1960s.

Thus, student recruitment efforts will be of significant importance to us in the future as we seek to maintain balanced independent-public enrollment ratios. We are grateful for student and alumni participation in recruitment efforts, and for the support parents have given us in these activities.

Related to these efforts to improve enrollment rates is our ongoing activity to help students complete their educational objectives once they have enrolled. We will continue, in the future, to look to such improvements, including counseling, financial aids, adaptations to changing life styles, greater student participation in administrative dialogue, and to upgrading facilities to meet students' non-classroom needs.

Moreover, we will continue our leadership role in encouraging the improvement of student benefits from governmental sources so that the students' freedom of choice may remain a strong, viable element in our pluralistic society.

It would be necessary to prepare lengthy volumes if I were to convey adequately all of the problems, challenges, strengths and opportunities that face us now or which will confront us in the years ahead. But the opportunities outweigh the problems, and Marquette stands ready to react to and with society to emerge more strongly as our University looks to the future.

We have an excellent student body—alert, able, of good spirit and of great promise. We have a strong faculty of which we may be very proud. We have dedicated Jesuits and lay men and women who are devoting entire lives to our philosophy and our objectives. We have thousands of loyal alumni who represent their Alma Mater well in their professions and who are willing to help provide for others the benefits that were theirs. We are blessed with hundreds of fine friends who choose freely to share in and support the work we do together.

We ask God to continue to bless our efforts because we want to and will succeed.

MARQUETTE

(By Peter E. Dobrowitz, undergraduate)

A few weeks ago, this paper ran two successive letters by readers, letters which got into an issue that seems to get lost among the new buildings, tuition increases, and basketball scores; the definition of the university "community" and its effect on student life.

On one hand, a university administrator spoke of the merits of the Marquette community, alluding to a comparison with a state-run school. Immediately following, a



rather irate student seemed to polarize the "issue" by blasting the first letter and doubting the worth of the Marquette community, especially when compared to a state school.

I have been asked to react to these two letters and, I guess, take sides or present a third viewpoint. My first impression was that both letters were classic examples of the relativity of our lives and the places in which we put our values.

So, instead of trying to attack or defend so elusive a target, I want to write my impressions of life at Marquette (for I think we can at least establish that it is a highly personal experience for each individual here) and hopefully to present some random thoughts for your consideration, or at least, observation.

For me, life at Marquette is more aptly phrased "life-at Marquette." When trying to view this university as some type of organic whole, it becomes highly difficult to force labels or make any generalities, an act both previous letter-writers were somewhat guilty of. I find it much easier to consider the human experience of life a constant one which continues to continue, utilizing Marquette as some type of limiting or qualifying factor.

I find myself a goal-oriented person, thus making Marquette a means to the end I seek, i.e., I know a diploma is a necessity for the type of future I hope to mold for myself. The institution rules of this community, then, become highly annoying and at times, totally frustrating, to me. I want to move in a direction and, in the end, agree to channel that flow through the mechanics of the institution. What is involved is not a compromise of principle, but an establishment of priority.

Marquette, the material structure, means little to me. What makes Marquette a significant part of my life is not Gesu, OSA, the Warriors or the Gym for that matter. Marquette is the vehicle which has brought people together, from across the country, to come to know one another, to broaden each other's scope. As I stated before, this is a highly personal experience and while I have no comparable experience in a "state school," I might draw one differentiation between the two, Marquette has the capability of presenting, if not a Christian community, at least a truly diversified one.

In the hall where I live, better still on my floor, every part of the country is represented—New York, California, Ohio, Illinois, even Puerto Rico. Interaction, flow of ideas, broadening of scope are all things which would seem to be pluses in this school's favor. Yet, even here, experience has shown me that the human experience is as diversified as the people who partake in it... anywhere! Whether at the heterogeneous MU, or a comparable homogenous state school, the processes of realization, growth and awareness go on.

Essentially, Marquette can be a strong influence if one chooses it to be. That organic community can stretch out from 10th Street to 18th with many stops in between and not only exist but flourish.

For me, the Marquette community consists of those who share those processes with me on a personal level, call them my friends. The Marquette community on another level represents a microcosm of the world out there, with its bureaucratic weavings and complexities; a microcosm that I choose to deal with when I am alone, to question, to perceive.

What it boils down to then, is that Marquette is really what you make it to be, for you. To generalize, to make statements without some type of personal qualification almost forces one into this endless maze of relativity. Just by this article many of you may think this is not your Marquette. Some

of you may be even wondering how we can be going to the same school, how I can be so optimistic, pessimistic, blind or out of contact with what's really going on in this place.

But that's good. To be definitive beyond yourself, under these circumstances, is to tread on uncharted territory. Someone once said life should be described as "etc." To be too definitive is to make this university one that puts periods on everything. I would much rather consider Marquette a comma.

#### MU LACKS MONEY, POWER, RICH ALUMNI (By Judson B. Allen, Associate Professor, English)

Marquette University is an institution whose supreme brilliance is its ability to survive almost overwhelming obstacles—difficulties of poverty, of regional cultural status, with whatever WASP prejudices remain—and to keep something going on in the classroom which pushes some students a little higher on their various ladders than they were when they came.

We are not an elite school. We have no rich clientele. We have virtually no endowment. Per student, we spend about what each pays, and that buys desperately little. That we have survived at all is due to brilliant management, which can squeeze savings in pennies until they amount to thousands, and which can also, when necessary, spend that very large sum of money which is exactly and barely enough to keep some crucial problem from overwhelming us.

Are the students getting their money's worth? It all depends. If they are looking for an authoritative institution to give them a ticket into the upper middle class—to stamp them, like prime beef, Grade A certified suburbanite professional—they are wasting their time. There is a widespread delusion abroad in America, that college education can do something to people which expands the exclusive ranks of the top ten per cent to include about half the population. It cannot. Even mathematics is against such an absurdity, if the realities of human stupidity were not enough. The great middle will always be middle. A "C" is a "C"—even though we now are calling it a "B."

If the students are looking for a Jesuit education as their money's worth they are probably half a generation too late. Until fairly recently, the Jesuits bore the image of the praetorian guard of God, and those who came to them for education were given in full measure their elitist rigor and their praetorian morale.

Jesuits now, it seems, reject this image, and American Catholics reject the self-contained Roman cultural ghetto within which its power could be focused and used. What lingers at Marquette (and this is a very great thing in our secular world) is a happy sense of God, as the ground both of being and of knowing. To learn in this atmosphere is a good thing, but even this is fading.

What Marquette professes to be is a university. It is in terms of this profession, finally, that all questions of money's worth must be answered. The student gets his money's worth if, in coming to Marquette, he gets that educational experience for which all universities, since medieval Paris and Oxford, have stood.

There are many ways to define a university. Personally, I prefer to think of it in terms of power of a particular kind—the power of a critical mass. The university has a special kind of exciting bigness. It has enough wealth, enough books in the library, enough buildings and exotic equipment, enough bright people, enough national and international reputations and connections, enough consultations and visitors, that whenever any member of that university sets about to look up something or find out something, he always runs into more than he expected, learns more than he really intended or need-

ed, and experiences the mind-blowing thrill that always comes from being thus a participant in concentrated power.

Marquette cannot provide this kind of experience to its faculty, nor even, consistently, to its graduate students. If it is any consolation, neither can most of the institutions in America which presently grant doctorates. But it can provide this kind of experience to many undergraduates. These, without doubt, find that they have gotten their money's worth. They come in contact with power.

In ideal terms—in utopian terms, if you will—the power in which the successful students participate is of three kinds. First and most obviously, there is the power which comes from being right—that is, from having authority in words based on research and profound investigation, and formulated by a brilliant and superbly trained mind. A physicist who wins the Nobel prize, an economist whom presidents trust and consult, a novelist who has shaped the ideal imagination of a generation, all are possessed of power. To be a member of a university is to be given access to that power.

The second kind of power is the power of a responsibility-assuming life style. This is what we are noticing when we say of a particularly impressive person that he was "born to command," or that he is a "take-charge guy." He is the kind of person who instinctively and automatically has the good idea, the plan that others follow. Universities exist to help people be like this. The university which supports, shapes, inspires, and informs its members until they have that absolutely confident competence which inspires trust and obedience in others has given them access to power.

Third and most trivial, though still important, is the power of real connections. In a true university, one can expect that many of the people one meets, young or old, either are or will someday be important and powerful. Simply to be given four years of their company is to be given lifetime access to a network of connections, helpers, access providers, and simple friends with whose help one's own personal power is enormously magnified.

If Marquette alumni over the next century remain loyal and become enormously rich, we may by then be a university wielding, and therefore providing to faculty and students alike, this kind of power. Meanwhile, the best we can do—and it is a good deal—is to be a base of operations, helping at least a few of our members participate on our behalf in that power in the world at large.

Marquette must, at least for the time being, be satisfied with this way of participating in the power which, for universities, defines true existence. Our supremely important present function, I think, is to see that at least a few of our students are pushed and coached and helped to get for themselves, and us, such honors as Rhodes, Danforth, Fulbright, and Marshall scholarships, or, in another field, the best possible contracts with professional basketball teams, or, in still another area, admission to those law schools whose graduates enter Wall Street firms and the benches of the higher federal courts.

At the faculty level, we are best served by outside honors and accomplishments. If some professor really has Nobel potential, he should be fully backed. We are not yet in a position to dignify a scholar by permitting him to wear our name; we only become so as we develop, to greater and greater prominence, members of the faculty whose names dignify us.

Marquette's best service to its students, then, is the promise to make a profoundly careful and ruthless assessment of their abilities, and then to choose the best and back

them. Conscience and mercy forbid that we do this in a purely Malthusian way, but we should and do try. Those chosen will not find life easy, but they will discover that power has its compensations. Those not chosen will have the satisfaction of knowing that they have helped someone who deserved that help, and will have learned a great deal to their own good as well.

Education is ultimately a mystery; if one takes the time for it, it very often happens, under the worst as well as the best of circumstances. Student tuition doesn't pay for the education. Four years of the student's life pays for that. The tuition is really just one's ticket of admission to the place of power.

#### MIDDLESEX COUNTY TRAFFIC SAFETY COMMITTEE: A FINE AND ACTIVE ORGANIZATION

#### HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Middlesex County Traffic Safety Committee and its dedicated members. Under the expert leadership of Mr. Joseph Dimontavich, the traffic safety committee is now in its 18th year of service to the Middlesex County communities and the State of New Jersey.

The traffic safety committee, a division of the New Jersey State Safety Council, was first organized in 1956 and has as its members men from the county's law enforcement units, and public health and safety groups, plus other outstanding leaders of the county.

The committee is a private organization supported by business and industry for the simple purpose of helping to prevent accidents. It conducts a broad safety program throughout the county with major emphasis on the traffic problem. As can be seen in the text below, the traffic safety committee reports to responsible public officials about particular traffic hazards found on the highways and roads in Middlesex County, makes recommendations for corrective action by the local authorities, follows proposals in the State legislature relative to traffic safety, and involves itself with the drunk-driver problem.

I have included the minutes of the committee's meeting on January 24, because it is representative of the Members' concern. Mr. Speaker, I truly commend the Middlesex County Traffic Safety Committee for its deep interest, dedication, and hard work, to improve traffic safety in Middlesex County. The efforts and accomplishments of Chairman Joseph Dimontavich and his members are to be praised. The minutes follow:

#### MINUTES OF JANUARY 24, 1973 MEETING

##### Present:

Mr. Joseph Dimontavich, Chairman, Delco Remy Division, General Motors.

Officer Nazareth Barcellona, Woodbridge Police Department.

Captain Roger W. Blair, Jr., Madison Township Police Department.

Inspector Victor C. Carney, New Jersey State Safety Council.

Lieutenant Anthony Catanese, New Brunswick Police Department.

Mr. Louis Dakelman, R. P., Middlesex County Pharmaceutical Society.

Lieutenant Albert J. Dellavalle, South Plainfield Police Department.

Sergeant Joseph Di Biase, Dunellen Police Department.

Sergeant Andrew Dobrovich, Carteret Police Department.

Patrolman Jerome Fedorczyk, East Brunswick Police Department.

Captain Allan B. Forrester, New Jersey State Safety Council.

Mr. James P. Gallagher, Raritan Bay Mental Health Center.

Trooper Peter Hausch, New Jersey State Police, Garden State Parkway.

Lieutenant Paul Jerzak, Piscataway Police Department.

Mr. Harold Klein, Borough Administrator, Metuchen.

Mr. David Mayerowitz, Joyce Kilmer Civic Association.

Mr. Jay Meyers, New Jersey International Movers.

Lieutenant Chester A. O'Such, Sayreville Police Department.

Captain Joseph J. Perrino, Metuchen Police Department.

Patrolman T. D. Riley, Spotswood Police Department.

Mr. Martin W. Rosen, Driver Education, Metuchen High School.

Trooper Allan Saffo, New Jersey State Police, New Jersey Turnpike.

Sergeant Barry Spillatore, South Brunswick Police Department.

Chief Dominic Spinelli, South Plainfield Police Department.

Captain Douglas Sprague, Sayreville Police Department.

Mr. John Stanik, Edison Township Public Schools.

Sergeant James Tedesco, South Amboy Police Department.

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Joseph Dimontavich who welcomed the members and their guests. He congratulated Lieutenant Dellavalle on his promotion and also welcomed as a new member, Mr. James P. Gallagher of the Raritan Bay Mental Health Center.

2. The minutes of the December 27, 1972 meeting were approved as mailed to all members.

3. In the absence of the Traffic Coordinator, Captain Forrester gave the Statistical Traffic Fatality Report as follows:

For the year 1972, (the final figures will not be available until January 25, 1973) Middlesex County had 84 traffic fatalities as compared with 96 for 1971, placing Middlesex County fifth on the "Traffic Fatality Record by Counties" and showing a minus 12 for 1972 over 1971. Forty-seven of the fatalities occurred on State Highways, 27 on county roads and ten on municipal streets. From January 1, 1973 to January 14, 1973, Middlesex County had one highway fatality and this places the County thirteenth on the "Record" and compares with three for the same period in 1972, showing a decrease of two. The one fatality listed for 1973 occurred on a county road.

Captain Forrester asked if any of the members could pinpoint the reason for the fine reduction in traffic fatalities for 1972 and congratulated all those persons who may have contributed to the fine reduction.

Chief Spinelli said that the credit for the fine reduction should go to the Traffic Safety Committee because it has been the basis for alerting police to the problems as they occur, and it was through the attendance of the members of the Safety Officers Association, newly formed, that has been instrumental in bringing back the safety messages to the various police departments through the Safety Officers Association.

Captain Forrester spoke of the activities of the State Police, the municipal police departments, and the educators in their efforts to avert an increase in alcohol related highway incidents after January 1, 1973 when the 18 year olds received their majority. It is most gratifying to read the figures for the early part of January, 1973 and see no indication of an increase of alcohol related highway incidents involving the 18 to 20 year olds.

4. Correspondence: Inspector Carney reported that on January 9, 1973 a letter had been sent to the Honorable Norman Tanzman, Senator. "The members of the Middlesex County Traffic Safety Committee appreciate your letter of December 11th and the inclusions which were discussed at their regular meeting of December 27, 1972."

"We are very much impressed with the contents of Assembly Bill No. 1525 in that it embodied much of the recommendations contained in the proposed law as prepared by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances. We would, therefore, seek your assistance and cooperation in any effort which would bring about introduction into law."

5. Mr. Martin Rosen said that the driver education people have been increasing the alcohol related programs in the driver education classes and he feels that this program will continue and will have its effect in producing a low number of 18 to 20 year olds involved in highway alcohol related incidents.

The members discussed the rumors concerning the reduction of penalties for violation of the drinking-driving laws. Captain Forrester said that nothing has been definitely resolved in this area; however, there are rumors to the effect that Mr. Roger Surprenant has been working on an alcohol countermeasures program and it is presumed that some of the recommendations will include a lessening of penalties with a provision that some rehabilitation or clinic attendance may be added.

Mr. Gallagher of the Raritan Bay Mental Health Center said that Middlesex County will be one of the counties in which the Alcohol Countermeasures Program will be carried on. The Program has not been firmed up yet but it will call for identification of the problem drinkers and some method of either rehabilitation or attendance at driver improvement classes.

Inspector Carney said that Roger Surprenant will probably include in his recommendations that New Jersey comply with the Federal Standard on Alcohol. New Jersey is deficient in two areas as far as compliance is concerned. One is that the blood alcohol level will be reduced from .15 to .10 and the other is that the surviving driver of a traffic fatality accident shall be given the test for alcohol.

Mr. Mayerowitz said that, as a representative of the Joyce Kilmer Civic Association, he has to report that the Association has been very cooperative with the Mayor and governing body of New Brunswick and they have made numerous recommendations as far as traffic safety is concerned and have seen some of the recommendations carried out. Since the inception of the Traffic Bureau in New Brunswick they have noticed a decrease in motor vehicle violations because of the increase in enforcement.

6. Inspector Carney discussed Assembly Bill No. 1525 that had been mentioned in the correspondence going to Senator Tanzman. He read A 1525 and made several side comments relative to the fact that they are working on upgrading the belts, the locks, and anchorage. The need for upgrading was apparent after seeing "Small Car Crashes" and the fact that the car seat belts were tearing away from the anchorage, and in some cases breaking. However, when the courts allow the automobile manufacturers to wait another year for the passive restraints



(air bags), it is an indication that there is a definite need for seat belt legislation to be passed now. A1525, said Inspector Carney, most nearly conforms to the recommendations made in the draft copy by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances.

On a motion that was approved by the majority of the members present, the Secretary was instructed to write to the Assembly legislative representatives of Middlesex County stating that the Middlesex County Traffic Safety Committee endorsed Assembly Bill No. 1525.

7. Mr. Martin Rosen wished to thank the law enforcement people, on behalf of all driver education people, for the fine cooperation they received in their programs on alcohol in the schools.

Mr. Rosen said that on December 15, 1972 he attended a demonstration of driver skills and found it to be an excellent program. Lieutenant Paul Jerzak participated in the program and, although they could not get out doors and actually see the driving skills test, they were more than aware of the need for this type of an educational program, and they were notified that special equipment can be placed on a vehicle that will simulate blow outs on any of the four tires of the vehicle, and after the tests the tire is inflated automatically.

8. Inspector Carney spoke relative to a newspaper article that had been in the News Tribune and indicated that the Borough of Sayreville was once again trying to prod the State into closing up the cuts in the safety medians in those portions of Route 9 and Route 35 which run through the Borough. The Borough Council sent a petition to the State Highway Department asking that the State close off the turn offs in the medians and erect fences along the grass safety dividers which separate the north from the south-bound lane on both State Highways.

The cuts in the safety dividers which allow cars and pedestrians to cross onto the opposite side of the highway present, according to police and Borough officials, a "very serious traffic hazard on the highways". Cars making U turns on the roads or crossing over from one side of the road to the center result in oncoming cars having to swerve or brake suddenly to avoid them. Pedestrians cross the roads which are heavily populated by roadside businesses and drive ins. The situations along the roads are considerably worsened during the nighttime hours or when there are inclement weather conditions. The Borough is particularly concerned with the heavily trafficked area of Route 9 across from the A & P shopping center, an area which is used extensively by pedestrians crossing the highway on their way to a local discotheque.

The same type of median cuts in Madison Township have already been blocked off by the State after protest from the Township.

Lieutenant O'Such of the Sayreville Police Department said that they made a study to eliminate certain hazards and one of the hazards was the cuts in the median on Route 9 and Route 35. On a motion that was approved by the majority of the members present, the Secretary was instructed to write a letter to the Department of Transportation stating that the Middlesex County Traffic Safety Committee endorses the recommendations of the Borough of Sayreville.

9. Officer Barcellona discussed the newspaper item concerning the safety car that had been briefly discussed by Captain Donnelly at the last meeting. After the discussion the members, on a motion that was approved by the majority, asked that a letter go to the manufacturers of the test car and ask him to bring the Middlesex County Traffic Safety Committee up to date on the testing that had been done on the car and any other rejections that he had received.

10. Captain Blair, Lieutenant O'Such and

Sergeant Tedesco discussed the need for a training program that would include instruction on accident investigations, records and analysis of records information. The reason given was that those persons who had been trained for the traffic bureau were now being transferred and new personnel were being assigned who had no knowledge of any of the above mentioned subjects.

Chief Spinelli said that, as Chairman of the Education Committee for the Middlesex County Police Chiefs Association, he would ask if the course could be run on a county basis.

After discussing the type of course and the need for such a course, a motion was approved by the majority of the members present that a letter go to Mr. Louis R. De Carolis and ask if there would be money available to run a course, similar to the one that had been conducted by the Bureau of Highway Safety in cooperation with the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police.

11. The Chairman thanked the members for their attendance and active participation in the discussions. He said the next meeting would be held on Wednesday, February 28, 1973, at 12:00 noon at Gambino's Inn, 284 Remsen Avenue, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

12. The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 P.M.

## POLK BROS. BEATS INFLATION

### HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Sol Polk, president of Polk Bros., one of the largest retail merchandising establishments in the United States, located in the 11th Congressional District of Illinois which I am privileged to represent, has initiated an extraordinary program to beat inflation, help our economy, and at the same time, encourage good health among all Americans.

To each of his customers who come in and make a purchase, he is giving them free—17 packets of seeds—enough to grow \$150 worth—or a whole truck load of fresh vegetables. The seeds are from a long-established and well-known company—Vaughan's Seed Co. of Downers Grove, Ill.

The whole family can participate in planting a garden, in being outside in the fresh air, in harvesting the crop, in eating freshly picked vegetables, and in reaping the rewards of good health by this outdoor activity.

And \$150 worth of vegetables would be a tremendous help to the average family food budget in this day and age of runaway inflation. In Chicago, during December 1972 to January 1973 alone, fruit and vegetable prices jumped 2.5 percent. Growing your own vegetables is certainly one effective way of saving your pocketbook, beating inflation, and helping the American economy along at the same time.

If everyone who gets seeds this spring at Polk Bros. plants them, we will have a bumper crop in the Chicagoland area worth several million dollars. And Polk Bros. will be responsible for bringing this prosperity to Chicagoland residents.

I want to congratulate Polk Bros.—not only for this public service—but also

for their dedicated efforts to bring the consumer courteous and efficient service along with low prices on high-quality, brand-name merchandise.

In fact, Polk Bros., during its 39-year existence, has merited the Brand Names Foundation "Retailer of the Year" award three times. This is a tribute to the enthusiasm, ingenuity, and hard work that the Polk brothers—Sol and Sam—have brought to their family-run business.

Again, I congratulate Polk Bros. and extend my best wishes for their continuing success in serving the retail merchandise needs of our community and our country.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I include an article that appeared in the May 4 edition of the Chicago Tribune entitled "Polk's Promotion Plants More Than Ideas". The article follows:

#### POLK'S PROMOTION PLANTS MORE THAN IDEAS

Don't be concerned that master merchandiser Sol Polk has gone to seed.

Quite the contrary, the imaginative entrepreneur has latched on to one of the hottest premium items around, seeds to grow vegetables, to hypo his store traffic—and build sales.

For any purchase \$25 or more, Polk is giving away a king-sized package of 17 packets of different seeds, worth \$5.05, which the supplier [Vaughan's Seed Co.] and retailer say will grow \$150 worth of vegetables.

Those are a lot of numbers to digest, except that a number of Polk Bros. shoppers have already decided they like the pitch.

"We've already gone thru 5,000 of them and by the end of May [the planting season], when the promotion ends, we should have given away 50,000," said Lester Bachmann, the retailer's executive vice president and Sol's right hand man.

Promotional activity, of course, is a byword at Polk.

Thru the years, the list of freebies there has indeed been a wide-ranging one, including roses, apples, wine, flags, and Santa Claus.

For each of them, Sol and Bachmann have a different marketing rationale.

"The cost of living is on everybody's mind," explained Bachmann. "The average household is concerned with the cost of food."

This seed promotion, said the Polk executive, is a "beautiful way of beating inflation and staying healthy."

The seed item, incidentally, is the first premium ever offered by Polk that didn't have immediate visibility.

But Polk isn't bothered by that. Instead he takes a long range look at the benefits.

"There will be thousands of new family gardens and many months of bountiful harvests," Sol said. "And people will think of us." Sort of a post point-of-purchase reminder.

#### IN HONOR OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

### HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the 25th anniversary of the founding of Israel, I should like to express my congratulations to a proud and courageous people on its outstanding record of accomplishment.

In a scant quarter of a century, Israel

has successfully withstood external hostility and overcome enormous internal obstacles.

Coming after a devastating holocaust which took the lives of 6 million Jews, the achievements of the new state—economic, political, and social—are a remarkable testament to the human spirit.

In honoring that indomitable spirit, I should like to share with my colleagues and the American people this eloquent tribute from the Sunday Globe of May 6, 1973.

#### AFTER 2000 YEARS, A HOMELAND AT LAST

Twenty-five years ago today . . . the 5th day of Iyyar on the ancient Hebrew calendar . . . Israel was reborn.

It was a renewal proclaimed to the world by its leader, David Ben-Gurion; a statement of promise and of hope for Jews all over the world.

(In 1948, the 5th day of Iyyar fell on May 14. For like Passover and Easter, it is a moveable celebration, corresponding this year to May 6 on the Gregorian calendar.)

Today, then, is the birthday of a modern Israel—a nation sovereign among the nations of the world.

Prime Minister Golda Meir has observed that 25 years are "but a brief moment for a nation with a memory more than 35 centuries long. Yet for us, this quarter of a century bears the quality of a wonder."

"For 19 centuries the Jews lived as a dispersed and persecuted minority throughout the world. Humiliation, expulsion and slaughter were the fate of our people in the countries of Europe, the Middle East and North Africa. For all those long centuries of suffering, our people clung to the hope of return, prayed for it, dreamt of it."

"Our vision of the future can best be summed up in the words of the Prophet Amos who lived 2800 years ago:

I will restore the fortunes of my people Israel,  
And they shall rebuild the ruined cities and inhabit them;  
They shall plant vineyards and drink their wine,  
And they shall make gardens and eat their fruit.  
I will plant them upon their land;  
And they shall never again be plucked up  
Out of the land which I have given them."

A bedrock of Israel is its Law of Return. Under it all Jews from the many lands of the diaspora (dispersion) now have a homeland. They are citizens the instant they reach Israeli soil. There has been an ingathering of fully 1,500,000 in this quarter of a century, many fleeing, many ransomed, many with dreadful tales of suffering.

Absorption has not been easy; Israel has set itself so many things to do—especially on immigration, housing, feeding, job-training, healing, teaching newcomers from dozens of lands the Biblical language that Abraham and Isaac spoke.

But there has been help. World-wide Jewry through the Jewish Agency and the United Jewish Appeal have steadily contributed. But the need, too, has grown consistently.

Of this help, the late Prime Minister Eshkol said:

"You'll find UJA money. You'll find it in every tree planted, in every piece of road, every house, every school. Scratch them a little and you'll find a dollar of UJA money at some layer."

What are these people like, who have been rebuilding a nation in an ancestral land they had occupied from the time of Adam and Eve until expelled by the Roman legions?

They vividly remind a visitor of the tales

of what Americans were like in post-colonial days when they were busy building the foundations of a Republic. Their enthusiasm is literally without bounds. Everyone seems to work, work hard. There is no unemployment. They exude hopefulness and strive for incredibly difficult goals.

This was no land of milk and honey to which they had returned. Travel its Biblical length, from Dan to Beersheba, from the Upper Galilee to the Upper Negev. It was rock and swamp, desert and barrenness. Natural resources, even water, were scarce. You understand why Moses had to smite a rock to bring forth water.

What did these people do?

They drained the swamps. They anchored the dunes. They built roads—even a sort of land-Suez, Eilat to Haifa, linking the Red Sea and the Mediterranean for the first time in history. They planted trees, eucalyptus beside the native palm, by the millions. Forests are coming back.

Forbidden for centuries to own land, they took up spades and hoes and planted crops. They studied the soil and learned methods, which they now teach to the entire world of how to get amazingly increased yields. Their first cash crops were oranges. From having to ration food, they have become exporters of it.

They turned the Lake of Galilee into a national reservoir. Not easy, for Galilee is small and far below sea level, yet, via the precious national water carrier system, it is water from Galilee that makes the Negev bloom. Their scientists seek urgently to unlock the secrets of de-salted seawater and even now, have established ways to recycle the sewage of Haifa and Tel Aviv.

The salts draining down for centuries untold into the Dead Sea, lowest spot on earth (1300 feet below sea level and without an outlet) have been converted into a thriving chemical industry at Sodom. The city of Arad (to work those chemicals) has sprung up as overnight in the Judean desert.

In 1948 when David Ben-Gurion went by camel, searching a sea outlet at Eilat there were just a few mud huts there. Today it is a thriving city and resort. It is also the southern terminus of a 42-inch pipeline for shipping oil, (of which Israel itself has a pitance). The line crosses the Negev to a newly built port at Ashdod. Now bustling, a few years ago it was merely a sand dune 20 miles south of Tel Aviv.

Denied airplane parts from abroad, they built an airplane industry. It is now Israel's single largest, employing 13,500 workmen, engaged in manufacturing a 10-seat twin-jet craft.

They created the greatest medical center in the Middle East, the Hadassah Hospital.

Scientists at Technion, in Haifa, even developed know-how that made more efficient America's Apollo trips to the moon.

No wonder Israel has had visitors, more than 5 million since revival of the state. To just accommodate their increasing numbers, there are plans for 12,000 more hotel rooms—all of which, added to the housing needs, dots building cranes over much of the landscape.

The attraction is unique.

Next to soccer, archeology is the national sport. Dig almost anywhere and you will uncover something from the past—even if it is only a piece of ancient glass on the beach at Caesaria. On the shore of the Lake of Galilee they have been unearthing, at Capernaum, the House of St. Peter. Such is the range of finds.

But above all, especially in Jerusalem, there is the knowledge that here trod an incomparable number of the great names of history. And include Bethlehem and Nazareth, to name two other places, and here came the great prophets, the patriarchs, the Biblical kings, and the Son of God.

No wonder, over all the earth, this is the land of pilgrimage of so many faiths.

#### NO TURNING BACK

#### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I recently read a very good article on food prices by Creston J. Foster, director of communications of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which I wish every food buyer in America would have the opportunity to read.

Lacking the facilities to provide such wide readership, I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that its wisdom will be available to my colleagues in Congress and the many other people who read the RECORD:

#### NO TURNING BACK

There is a possibility that American consumers may never again have some of the low food prices they have had in the past decade. Some economists are saying that food prices may level off in the last half of 1973, but none are predicting that the clock is going to be turned back to the so-called good old days when hamburger was 20 cents a pound.

There is nothing in the immediate future which indicates that wages of factory workers are going to be decreased. Certainly there isn't much hope that taxes will be cut at local, state or federal levels.

There is considerable talk about the need to curb inflation. But there seems to be few signs from Congress that federal spending will be cut to the level of government income—and it's government deficits that cause inflation. Increased money supplies chase after available goods and you have higher prices all around.

With these things in mind, why should farm prices drop? It's true that if the Administration has overreacted to increased world demand and we have a return to surplus production, farm prices would drop. However, with the prices of everything the farmer buys for production at high fixed level, how can a farmer produce at lower prices and still stay in business.

If we had a depression, wouldn't farm prices drop? Yes, they might, but in such an event, all price levels would drop as unemployment would decrease demand, especially for protein items such as meat. But with all the built-in legislative stabilization factors on the books today, it's unlikely that we would experience the severity of the Depression of the 1930s.

It might take some doing, but consumers are faced with considerable adjustment in their thinking about food prices. They can't have high wages and low food prices. Twenty-cent hamburger goes with 60-cent an hour wages. In fact, food prices haven't caught up yet with wages. In the past 20 years, wages have more than doubled while food prices have gone 44 per cent.

Other factors are working against lower farm production costs and lower food prices. Farmers are faced with considerable investment to meet the rigid standards of environmental protection controls, such as regulations controlling runoff from feedlots. These standards are being imposed at both state and national levels. Some estimate these investments to meet such standards may cost individual farmers \$10,000 or more.

Farmers also are faced with an energy crisis—as are many other enterprises. Unless this crisis is met, how will farmers increase production in the face of decreasing fuel and power supplies?

These are some of the things that the



shopper should consider as she pushes her grocery cart through the supermarket.—Creston J. Foster, Director of Communications, American Farm Bureau Federation.

# FOUNDING CONFERENCE FOR A NATIONAL DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AGAINST RACIST AND POLITICAL REPRESSION

## HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Internal Security, Mr. ICHORD, made a statement in the RECORD on the founding conference for a National Defense Organization Against Racist and Political Repression, to be held in Chicago at the Pick-Congress Hotel over the weekend of May 11-12, 1973. The chairman's statement was both timely and informative, and it is my purpose today to set forth additional background material to supplement his remarks and to further clarify the ties between this conference and its initiator, the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Literature disseminated by the founding conference and other Communist groups makes it clear that the conference is in reality a mobilization of Communist strength that has evolved from other party defense efforts, most notably the Soledad Brothers Defense Committee—later known as the Soledad Brothers Legal Committee—and the National United Committee to Free Angela Davis and All Political Prisoners.

Chairman of the Soledad Brothers Defense Committee and Soledad Brothers Legal Committee, for example, was Dr. Carlton Goodlett, a former member of the Communist Party who has remained a faithful party adherent and who is today a member of the Presidential Committee on the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council, the principal international Communist "peace" front. Goodlett has also long been active in the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, cited by the Committee on Internal Security as being under the predominant influence of the CPUSA, and was a sponsor of the National United Committee to Free Angela Davis. A large number of sponsors of the upcoming founding conference in Chicago also have been affiliated with both the CPUSA-dominated PCPJ and the CPUSA-created Angela Davis defense movement.

Treasurer of the Soledad Brothers group was Prof. Linus Pauling, identified as a secret member of the CPUSA by former Party National Committee member Louis Budenz in 1952. Among the group's sponsors were Jane Fonda, who has publicly declared herself to be in favor of a Communist society; Arthur Kinoy, a faithful party supporter who serves today as vice president of the party's "legal bulwark," the National Lawyers Guild; author Jessica Mitford, an identified member of the CPUSA; CPUSA member Pete Seeger; an identified CPUSA member and NLG attorney Morton Stavis.

The national co-coordinators of the National United Committee to Free Angela Davis and All Political Prisoners—NUCFAD—were Fania Davis Jordan, sister of Angela Davis, and Franklin Alexander. Both Jordan and Alexander are self-professed members of the Communist Party. One of the co-treasurers of the NUCFAD was California attorney Vincent Hallinan, veteran CPUSA member and father of prominent party members Matthew and Terence Hallinan. Among the sponsors of the NUCFAD were the following people who are or have been at various times members of the Communist Party: Herbert Aptheker, director of the CPUSA-created American Institute for Marxist Studies and member of the Presidential Committee of the World Peace Council; Carl Bloice, who has been a member of the CPUSA National Committee; Rev. Stephen H. Fritchman, honorary co-chairman of the CPUSA-front Los Angeles Committee for Defense of the Bill of Rights; John Gallo, director of the CPUSA-front Center for Marxist Education in New York City; Dr. Carlton Goodlett; Jesse Gray, former Harlem organizer for the party; Gus Hall, party general secretary; Esther Jackson, wife of top party leader James E. Jackson; Rockwell Kent, long-time leader in the Communist Party-controlled National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; Walter Lowenfels, a sponsor of the CPUSA's "cultural" magazine American Dialog; Charlene Mitchell, member of the CPUSA National Committee; William L. Patterson, long-time member of the party national committee; Prof. Sidney Peck, one-time chairman of the Wisconsin State Committee of the CPUSA and leading activist in the November 8 Mobilization Committee, Spring Mobilization Committee, National Mobilization Committee, New Mobilization Committee, and National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression, all of which were Communist-dominated predecessors of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, in which Peck has also been a guiding force; Jesse Prosten, a member of the board of directors of the CPUSA-controlled Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights; artist Anton Refregier, another sponsor of American Dialog; Pauline Rosen, a leading party representative in the "peace" movement and prominent activist in the party-dominated PCPJ; Prof. Carlos Russell, member of the State Committee of the CPUSA-created Freedom and Peace Party of New York State, supporter of the CPUSA-front Fort Hood Three Defense Committee and W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, and member of the executive board of the national Conference for New Politics, a now-defunct organization that was taken over by the Communist Party; Irving Sarnoff, leader of the CPUSA-front Peace Action Council of Southern California and member of the World Peace Council; folk-singer Pete Seeger, sponsor of American Dialog; Jack Spiegel, a member of the controlling CPUSA clique in the Chicago Peace Council; John Talbutt, an activist in party industrial con-

centration and trade union work; Dalton Trumbo, one of the original "Hollywood Ten;" Jarvis Tyner, national chairman of the CPUSA-controlled Young Workers Liberation League and member of the Party National Committee; Doris Brin Walker, an attorney with the NLG; Henry Winston, national chairman of the CPUSA; and Michigan State Senator Coleman Young, who refused in 1952 to affirm or deny party membership in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Other sponsors of the NUCFAD included Jane Fonda; self-professed Communist David Dellinger, one of the leaders of the Communist-dominated "peace" movement in the United States; Prof. Donald Kalish, another leader in the CPUSA-front Peace Action Council of Southern California who has proclaimed himself to be "far to the left" of the CPUSA; Rev. Cecil Williams, another member of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council; and Rev. Ralph Abernathy, one of the "Presidents of Honour" of the WPC.

The Communist-front character of the Soledad Brothers Defense—Legal—Committee was made crystal clear in the May 26, 1972, issue of "Frame Up: A Weekly Trial Bulletin from the National United Committee to Free Angela Davis and All Political Prisoners." Pages 2 and 3 of this publication reflect that defense witness Valerie Mitchell—known to her friends as "Tamu," Swahili for "sweetness"—was Angela's roommate in 1970. She testified that:

Angela moved out of their apartment in July, 1970 because it had become a center for activities of the Soledad Brothers Defense Committee and the Che-Lumumba Club of the Communist Party, of which both Angela and Tamu were members [Emphasis added].

Similarly, if the heavy representation of Communists in the list of officers and sponsors of the NUCFAD were not enough to convince anyone of that organization's Communist-front character there was a "Special Letter To All Committees" issued by the NUCFAD in June 1972 that was signed by the "NUCFAD National Staff." Of the eight people listed, seven—Franklin Alexander, Fania Davis Jordan, Charlene Mitchell, Kendra Alexander, Bettina Aptheker, Bob Klonsky, and Angela Davis—are known members of the CPUSA.

This document also reveals that:

There had been discussion all across the country about the need for a national defense organization. We seem to be agreed that a national organization which sets for itself the task of freeing all political prisoners and confronting the spectre of encroaching fascism [sic] in this land is not only desirable but necessary. In organizing a broad, mass defense for Angela Davis, we have already laid the base for such a national body [Emphasis added].

Anticipating a summer of intensive local and regional organizing for a projected national conference, the NUCFAD announced in this document that:

Our national office in San Francisco will remain open during most of the summer to assist local people working in various regions of the country to pull these conferences together.

Another passage of particular significance is the following:

Alternatively, we urge committees and individuals to become active in the struggles around prison conditions. These struggles, mounted in a radical way by the Soledad Brothers Defense Committee, by NUCFAD, and by many other groups, have allowed us to involve a very broad sector of the population in struggle against repression, for the treatment of prisoners reveals economic, racial and political oppression [sic] on a very intense level.

Among the cases deemed important by the NUCFAD in organizing, as shown by this official NUCFAD mailing, were the cases of Billy Dean Smith, the so-called San Quentin 6, Daniel Ellsberg and Anthony Russo, and various unnamed "Attica and Tombs defendants who either are or shortly will be on trial in New York." The NUCFAD also volunteered assistance in locating the defense committees involved in these and other cases.

Significantly, among the leaders or sponsors of the Soledad Brothers Defense—Legal—Committee with ties to the CPUSA listed above, both Goodlett and Seeger are sponsors for the founding conference, as shown on official lists disseminated by the conference's organizing committee, while the following Communist leaders and sponsors of the NUCFAD, according to the same official sponsor lists, are supporting the conference: Herbert Aptheker, Carlton Goodlett, Jesse Gray, Walter Lowenfels, Charlene Mitchell, William L. Patterson, Sidney Peck, Jesse Prosten, Anton Refregier, Carlos Russel, Irving Sarnoff, Pete Seeger, Jack Spiegel, Jarvis Tyner, and Henry Winston.

Further ties between the founding conference and the Communist Party-organized NUCFAD show up in the tentative schedule for the conference currently being disseminated by the organizing committee. For example, the keynote address on Saturday, May 12, is to be delivered by Angela Davis, who was one of the members of the national staff of her own defense committee. The "chairperson" for a workshop on "Repressive Legislation" is Coleman Young, with Charlene Mitchell scheduled as "chairperson" for the workshop on "Repression of Political Organizations and Individuals." One of the scheduled participants in the workshop on "Repression and Labor" is John Talbutt; and among the scheduled speakers at a "Mass Rally" to be held on the evening of May 12 are Angela Davis and Ralph Abernathy.

Other prominent members of the Communist Party scheduled to participate in the conference, as shown by official conference literature, include Carl Braden, long a leader in the CPUSA-controlled Southern Conference Educational Fund, a Kentucky-based group that serves as a regional office for the CPUSA's National Committee Against Repressive Legislation; Rose Chernin, the executive secretary of the Los Angeles Committee for Defense of the Bill of Rights; Richard Criley, executive director of the Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights, another regional affiliate of the NCARL; and Fred Gaboury, Midwest Trade Union Secretary for the CPUSA and one of the

prime movers in the Communist Party-organized National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy—TUAD. Another scheduled participant is Irma Zeigas, chairwoman of the Amnesty Committee of Women Strike for Peace, an alleged "peace" group that has been heavily infiltrated by the Communist Party and consistently supported by the party since its founding in the fall of 1961.

Conference literature disseminated to date reflects sponsorship by a number of other present or past Communist Party members, in addition to those already named. They include: John J. Abt, a New York attorney and veteran member of the CPUSA; Hursel Alexander, a leading California Communist; Anne and Carl Braden; Bert Corona; Richard Criley; Angela Davis; Al Evanoff, a prominent New York labor leader and activist in PCPJ; Abe Feinglass, a Chicago labor figure also active in the Communist-dominated "peace" movement; Conrad Lynn, a New York attorney who was thrown out of the CPUSA and gravitated to other Communist groups over the years, including the SWP, and who has an unenviable record of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes; John T. McTernan, a Los Angeles attorney active in the National Lawyers Guild; Rev. William Howard Melish, who has been active in such Communist fronts as the Southern Conference Educational Fund and the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; George B. Murphy, Jr., also active in the NCASF; Prof. John Pappademos, an editorial board member of the CPUSA's Labor Today who served as a candidate for Presidential Elector on the CPUSA ticket in Illinois during the 1972 elections; Fred Rinaldo, chairman of the Los Angeles Committee for Defense of the Bill of Rights; Frank Wilkinson, the driving force behind the Party's National Committee Against Repressive Legislation; Dr. Edward K. Barsky, long an active leader of the Communist Party-created Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade; Rose Chernin; Sarah Cunningham, a New York actress; Prof. Philip S. Foner, Lincoln University, Lincoln, Pa.; Robert Klonsky; John Howard Lawson, Communist screen writer; Lewis Moroze, active in the Plainfield Joint Defense Committee, a New Jersey group, chairman of the New Jersey Committee to Free Angela Davis, and New Jersey delegate to the 1957 16th National Convention of the CPUSA; Louise Patterson, wife of William L. Patterson; David Poindexter, a close associate of Angela Davis; John Randolph, actor and husband of Sarah Cunningham, listed above; Jessica Smith, editor of the CPUSA's New World Review; and Prof. Dirk J. Struik, also a prominent leader of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship and supporter of innumerable Communist fronts.

Included also are several representatives of the CPUSA's "legal bulwark," the National Lawyers Guild, as well as a representative of the CPUSA-controlled Southern Conference Educational Fund. Among the organizations listed as

sponsors are "Trade Unions for Action and Democracy, Chicago, Ill.," a Communist front group, and Northern Californians Against Repressive Legislation, another affiliate of the CPUSA-controlled NCARL.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the above data will serve as a valuable supplement to the informative statement made by Chairman ICHORD and that good Americans will be alerted to the true nature of this phony antirepression conference and will recognize it for what it really is: the launching of one of the largest and most ambitious front organizations ever created by the Communist Party, U.S.A., to deceive the gullible into supporting party objectives.

#### POLITICAL PRISONERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the desperate plight of political prisoners in South Vietnam is called to our attention once again, this time by prominent citizens in Japan. Their detailed allegations are contained in an excellent article which I would like to share with my colleagues:

[From the Reporter, April 1973]

AN APPEAL FROM LEADING LAWYERS AND CLERGY IN JAPAN

(By Daniel Crystal)

Leading lawyers and clergy in Japan have sent out an urgent message advising the international community concerned about human freedom and dignity that there is need for immediate action to investigate what the Thieu administration in South Vietnam is doing with the civilian prisoners held in its prisons and "tiger cages" because they opposed the war.

"What we cannot and must never overlook," their statement reads, "is that in the South, hundreds of thousands of patriots and peace-loving people have been arrested unlawfully, put in prison without trial, tortured, maltreated and now are being maimed or murdered either secretly or openly by the Nguyen Van Thieu regime. They are patriots who nurtured peace as their jewel, along with their national independence, unity and territorial integrity, more than anything else. They are men and women of all ages and of all walks of life, including distinguished men of faith, law, learning and letters, and some ex-MPs. They include also toiling workers, peasants and students of both sexes.

"They are now confined within numerous prisons and penitentiaries, such as those on Polo-Condor Island (Comson) known for its notorious 'tiger cages', Phu Quoc Is., Chi Hoa, Thu Duc and others, as well as in what they disguise as 'Strategic' or now, 'New Life Hamlets' or 'Refugee Camps' all of which are no better than the Hitlerite concentration camps.

"There they are facing the most cruel tortures, maltreatment of all sorts and now, more than ever, are in danger of extermination."

Among the Japanese who signed the appeal are Mr. Toraa Ogiyama, Ex-President, The Japan Bar Association, Mr. Susum



Ozaki, Chairman, The Japan Bar Association, Civil Liberties Committee, Mr. Rinji Kondo, Ex-High Court Chief Justice, Mr. Yoichi Mohri, Ex-Chairman, Osaka Bar Association, and other distinguished educators and professionals.

The joint appeal by these legal and religious leaders of Japan calls world attention to the following:

1. In addition to the tremendous number of civilian detainees of the past, those arrested by the Thieu Administration of South Vietnam since last April have shown a very sharp increase, which although the total number is not known, is estimated to be between 20,000 and 30,000.

2. "There is almost no hope of relieving them or defending them, as even the activities of humanitarian defense organizations such as 'The Committee for a Better Prison Regime' are not being allowed now."

3. "The danger is real, now more than ever, of them being murdered or maimed from the tortures behind curtains, even as the treaty for ending the war and restoring peace in Vietnam is being signed."

Among the specific charges made in this appeal by the Japanese dignitaries are these:

Approximately 30,000 civilians suspected of peace activities in South Vietnam have been arrested and detained since April 1972. About 5,000 of those who had been arrested in Saigon, Hue, Da Nang, Lagsia, and elsewhere were deported to prisons on Polo-Condor and Phu Hoc islands without trial.

Not less than 1,000 were either killed or wounded within the last year in the prison of Polo-Condor, Phu Quoc and Chi Hoa alone.

In the prisons of Phu Quoc and Lagsia, poisons were used for the extermination of political prisoners.

At present, these civilian prisoners are being assassinated. Detainees who have been unlawfully arrested are being screened, and diverted into the criminal prisons so that the Thieu regime should not be forced to release them as part of the Ceasefire Agreement.

The charges made by this group of Japanese jurists, lawyers, and clergy are serious in the extreme. They are painfully mindful of the appeals that were made on behalf of German and Austrian Jewry during the Nazi era. The world from hindsight laments the Holocaust. There appears to be a very real danger today of decimation of South Vietnamese of all walks of life whose essential crime in the eyes of the Thieu regime is that they supported peace and opposed that dictatorial regime.

And, in the opinion of this writer, our national honor is deeply involved in securing their release. We all rejoice that our war prisoners have been released. If peace is ever to come to Southeast Asia, it must come through national reconciliation.

This country has dirtied its hands with enough blood in South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. We cannot evade responsibility for what is going on in the prisons of South Vietnam. We have supported the Thieu administration in every possible way. Unless we are to be regarded worldwide as hypocrites, we must make the Ceasefire Agreement work. All prisoners must be released. Our national honor demands no less.

The appeal by these distinguished Japanese lawyers, judges, clergy, and scholars should shock the conscience of us all.

They request that an international investigation team, including distinguished personalities of the U.S.A. be sent without delay to Saigon to carry out on-the-spot and thorough-going inquiries to clarify all these matters of such grave and common concern.

A similar appeal fell on deaf ears in the '30s when the slaughter was in Europe.

Where is our conscience these days—some 40 years later?

## SENATOR MCGOVERN APPRAISES DEMOCRATIC PARTY REFORMS

### HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of being a participant in the opening session of the Charter Commission of the Democratic Party, held in Washington last month. The Commission was addressed by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, who presented a very interesting appraisal of the reforms in the delegate selection processes that were accomplished by the 1968 and 1972 conventions.

Those reforms have been widely discussed, both within the Democratic Party and among the public generally. Senator MCGOVERN's proposals for modification of the delegate selection reforms, and his further comments on the proposed Democratic Party Charter are provocative, stimulating, and worthy of the attention of the Members of this House.

The changes that Senator MCGOVERN has now suggested, for the most part, head in the right direction and I would hope that they can be seriously considered before the 1974 Party Conference and the 1976 Democratic National Convention.

I include, Mr. Speaker, Senator MCGOVERN's remarks at this point in the RECORD.

#### REMARKS OF SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN

As I look over this meeting—so well attended by party members and officials and the national press—I am struck by the contrast with the first meeting four years ago of the Commission I chaired. No one paid much attention to us then. But I have the feeling, Governor Sanford, that your work will be watched much more carefully.

Your work should begin by building and improving the reforms to which, for better or worse, my name seems indelibly attached. I realize that some of the following suggestions may fall outside the strict jurisdiction of this Commission, but I believe that you cannot exercise your mandate outside the broader context of the future of all the reforms.

I start with this premise: The reforms did not fail. Never in the history of our party or any party have so many people participated in the selection of a nominee. Despite the discomfort of change and the difficulties of the campaign, I am convinced that this period will be remembered with pride by the Democrats who come after us. It was here, at this time, they will say, that this party affirmed its will to survive—to serve a new age by choosing reform over retrenchment—while the other party was stagnating in the complacency of an election landslide, which was a personal triumph for one man, but revealed in the rest of the results a deep distrust of a selfish and even corrupt conception of the public good.

So, as Democrats, we will not turn our backs on those who placed their faith in our good will and good sense. We will not turn back to the discredited practices which had sadly crept into our party. We will preserve the progress of the past four years.

But we need not pretend that the reforms were written in stone. Every sound law must be informed and improved by experience. Human rules will fail sometimes, for human beings are frail always. And the reform rules

were not without some defects or errors of interpretation even as they are properly judged a general success.

Criticism of the reforms appears to fall within two broad areas—first, the problems of what proved in some cases to be a quota system for the selection of delegates—and second, the fear, shared by some Democrats, that the system operated to deprive the Convention of the work and the wisdom of the Party's most senior leaders.

In the area of delegate selection, the McGovern Commission framed the reformed rules as a remedy for past error. The guidelines did not call for quotas. An amendment was introduced to require "representation in reasonable relationship to the group's presence in the population of the state." But this passed, only after an additional amendment by Governor Leroy Collins, which read: "It is the understanding of the Commission that this is not to be accomplished by the mandatory imposition of quotas."

Yet some party members arrived at a different conclusion. Finally, after a period of intense discussion, the National Chairman agreed that a deficient mathematical percentage of affected groups on a state delegation was *prima facie* grounds for a credentials challenge.

On the one hand was the traditional view that who a representative is matters less than the fact that he or she is freely and fairly chosen. This is the ordinary meaning of representation, and it is reflected in most state election statutes and party rules.

On the other hand is the notion that a society can be represented only by a microcosm of the whole, a perfect reflection in miniature of its various groups.

This is the theory which requires a percentage quota for each group in the nation. I do not believe such a system is workable. I believe that delegates should represent people—not types of people.

And I think two specific changes in the reform rules are in order.

First, the phrase "reasonable relationship to their presence in the population of the state" should be removed from the guidelines. That will eliminate the misunderstanding that led to the imposition of quotas while leaving intact the language requiring affirmative action to insure full and fair representation. And the Commission on Delegate Selection and Party Structure, supported by this Commission, should define specifically what such action means with respect to age and sex, as the Special Equal Rights Committee did with respect to minorities.

Second, we should also seek a delegate selection system that truly reflects the preferences of Democratic voters. "Widespread participation in the slate-making process" should not be construed to require surrender of the slate-making power by the presidential candidates.

The party should amend its guidelines to secure the right of presidential candidates to protect the integrity of the method that chooses delegates in their name. The same right should be granted to party organizations or any other group that decides to run a slate independently.

By these steps, I believe we can make the Democratic party more truly representative of Democratic voters. And how, beyond that, can we guarantee the participation of senior party leaders at national conventions—which was, in the minds of some, the second notable area where the reform rules were lacking?

It should be pointed out that under the guidelines, state party organizations already have the right to select 10% of each delegation to the National Convention. Few state parties did so in 1972. Yet this procedure could have provided places for major officials.

That approach, it seems to me, is superior

to the proposal that members of the Congress be designated automatic delegates. It avoids conflicts with the prohibition against ex-officio appointments because under it, delegates are chosen by the party organization not solely by virtue of their public position. It also avoids embarrassment to the party in cases where Democrats in the Congress may decline to serve at the convention.

At the same time, the party should act to insure fair representation of party leaders. In 1971, the members of the National Committee were stripped of their convention voting rights, not by the Reform Commission, but by their own decision. Now we should restore those rights. This can be done within the spirit of the reforms because, for the first time in history, the National Committee is apportioned in an equitable manner. But it will require as well that the Charter Commission consider the adoption of uniform standards for election to the Committee. Today the rules vary from state to state. By framing a single standard, the Commission can assure that National Committee members are chosen in a timely manner reflecting the will of Democrats in their states—that they are not made delegates just because they are committee members, but are fairly elected as both committee members and delegates.

In many respects, the reform rules worked better than our best expectations. Everyone knows that, and no one really wants to return the party to secret caucuses, fraudulent proxies, and backroom deals. No one wants to betray those who have relied on the sincerity of the reforms. Still, the reform rules were an innovation, a voyage on an uncharted sea—and they can be improved. Today I have suggested some ways to a National Convention based, not on less reform, but on more reform of the right kind.

But a great political party does not live by nominating conventions alone. This truth, more than anything else, is what gave birth to the Charter Commission. The scope of your mandate is a recognition of the fact that our conduct of the business of the Democratic party for the next four years, will help to determine whether the people will entrust us with the conduct of public business in the next Presidential term.

So you must now raise and respond to difficult questions of party organization and purpose. I would like to examine four of them with you briefly.

First, what kind of mid-term convention should the Democratic party convene in 1974?

There are two types of issues that the mid-term convention could take up—the public policy issues that are normally the subject of political platforms, and the party policy issues that are especially relevant to Democrats committed to shaping a responsive and responsible party organization. The National Committee has the power to determine what issues will be discussed. It will control the agenda of the mid-term convention. And I believe that agenda should be limited to pressing questions of party policy, specifically the Charter. Constitution-making is an epic undertaking. It requires careful, concentrated, unhurried consideration—precisely what the 1974 Convention must give to the Charter that will make it the important document it deserves to be. It deserves, and the public will demand, that it be treated as more than an incidental matter amid a torrent of other resolutions. Other issues are important, but they can be aired in other forums. The Founding Fathers did not meet in Philadelphia in 1787 to debate the tariff, but to devise a governmental system that could equitably set tariffs. And the Democratic party should not meet in mid-term convention in 1974 to debate every concern of any delegate, but to devise a party organization that can equitably settle disputes and set policy in the future.

Second, should the national party adopt a formal plan of enrolling dues-paying members?

Enrolled party membership has been a recurring question, and you must examine its implications carefully. For example, what rights or privileges will attach to such membership? What provision will be made for those who cannot pay dues because they are in poverty, or will not as a matter of principle? Democrats in some states have experimented with dues-paying membership without great success. Before embarking on a similar venture, we must make certain that it will sustain and strengthen the party, not narrow its base.

Third, should there be uniform rules governing state and local Democratic organizations?

During the last several years, I have met and worked with countless Democrats across America. And I have found that the state of our party organizations varies as widely as the shape of our geography. I have found also, that in our party, as in our country, there is strength in diversity. Therefore, I oppose an enforced conformity of rules except where the principles or progress of the whole party are at stake. But there is a difference between coercion and cooperation. There are places in America where people still hide the fact that they are Democrats.

There are places where the party is frail and faltering. And there should be a more effective system of cooperation among state parties, and between state parties and the national party—so the strong may strengthen the weak, and stronger Democratic organizations may better serve the public interest. I hope the possibilities and practicalities of such a system will be a priority of this Commission.

Finally, should the Democratic party be affiliated at the national level with other organizations?

I have no sure answer to this question. But I think the Charter Commission should consider more formal alliances with groups that generally share our goals, such as labor unions, certain farm organizations, and the civil rights movement. Their members have traditionally been tireless supporters of Democratic candidates. And events have shown that we cannot win without them. At a minimum the Commission should develop methods to improve our relations with like-minded non-affiliates. Actual affiliation may be a long way off, if ever, but we must insure that their voices will be heard and heeded.

Like those of us who served on the Reform Commission, you will sometimes find your task not only tough but tedious. But it is the nuts and bolts of organization, as much as anything else, that will decide the future and the fate of the Democratic Party. And just as we will succeed or fail together, so we must stand together now, putting aside selfish interests and past divisions, to perfect a party organization that will bring Democrats home because it will make this party truly a home for all of us.

I deeply believe that, as Democrats, the things which unite us are stronger than the things which divide us.

All of us want a party that will include those who have been left out of power without excluding those who have worked hard in politics.

All of us want the Democratic Party to be as democratic as our will and wisdom can make it.

And all of us want to win again—not by looking wistfully to the past—but by welcoming the future.

Democrats have made mistakes, and there is surely blame enough for everyone, including me. During the last six years, we have wasted so much of ourselves in factional dispute and disarray. Now it is our common mission to prepare, not just for the next election, but the next generation. It is our

mission to preserve the proud and precious heritage of Democratic commitment, not to the privileged, but to the people—to those who earn a living with their hands, to the powerless who are poor or victims of prejudice, to our children who deserve a decent education instead of more wars that teach them how to kill.

The Democratic Party is their voice, and it must speak for them, now and in 1976 and during the years beyond. It must be a reformed party, open, responsive, and compassionate.

And in your effort to achieve that, Governor Sanford, this Commission has my enthusiastic support.

## ABORTION

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court's recent decision on the subject of abortion had caused some controversy. The following analysis of those decisions of the April 1973 issue of the American Bar Association Journal throws some light on the questions raised:

#### COURT ADOPTS ABORTION TRIMESTER RULE

The first of the abortion cases was *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. —, 35 L.Ed. 2d 147, 93 S.Ct. 705, 41 U.S.L.W. 4213.

Suit was filed in a three-judge federal district court by an unmarried woman who was pregnant, challenging the validity of the Texas statute prohibiting abortions except when necessary to save the life of the mother. The complaint sought a declaratory judgment and an injunction, contending that the statute abridged the woman's right of personal privacy protected by the First, Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, and Fourteenth Amendments.

A physician against whom two state prosecutions were pending for violation of the abortion statute was permitted to intervene, and the district court consolidated the case with another brought by a childless married couple attacking the same statute.

The district court upheld the right of the pregnant woman and the physician to sue, but ruled that the childless couple had failed to allege facts sufficient to state a controversy and did not have standing to sue. The court ruled that the "fundamental right of single women and married persons to choose whether to have children is protected by the Ninth Amendment, through the Fourteenth Amendment," and that the antiabortion act was unconstitutionally vague. It denied an injunction. 314 F. Supp. 1217.

On direct appeal to the Supreme Court, the Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Blackmun, affirmed as to the pregnant woman but reversed as to the physician, holding that he had made no allegation of any substantial or immediate threat to any federally protected right that could not be asserted in the state proceedings.

The Court also decided that the case was not moot even though the pregnancy occurred in 1970. "Pregnancy often comes more than once to the same woman, and in the general population, if man is to survive, it will always be with us," the Court observed. "Pregnancy provides a classic justification for a conclusion of nonmootness. It truly could be 'capable of repetition, yet evading review.'"

The Court spent a considerable portion of its opinion on the history of legal and public attitudes toward abortion to demonstrate that antiabortion laws are of relatively re-



cent vintage, most of them in the United States dating from the latter half of the nineteenth century.

The Court decided that the constitutional right of privacy, which it seemed to prefer to base on the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment rather than on the Ninth Amendment, was broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to terminate her pregnancy.

The right is not absolute, the Court went on, because "it is reasonable and appropriate for a State to decide that at some point in time another interest, that of health of the mother or that of potential human life, becomes significantly involved. The woman's privacy is no longer sole and any right of privacy she possesses must be measured accordingly."

"With respect to the State's important and legitimate interest in the health of the mother, the 'compelling' point, in the light of present medical knowledge, is at approximately the end of the first trimester. This is so because of the now established medical fact . . . that until the end of the first trimester morality in abortion is less than morality in normal childbirth. It follows that, from and after this point, a State may regulate the abortion procedure to the extent that the regulation reasonably relates to the preservation and protection of maternal health."

The Chief Justice and Justices Douglas and Stewart wrote concurring opinions, and Justices White and Rehnquist dissented.

The second abortion case was *Doe v. Bolton*, 410 U.S.—35 L.Ed. 2d 201, 93 S.Ct. 739, 41 U.S.L.W. 4233.

The case was treated separately because of the differences between the Georgia statute and the Texas statute in *Roe v. Wade*. The Texas statute was typical of antiabortion statutes long in effect in many states, but the Georgia statute, which was enacted in 1968, follows the provisions of the American Law Institute's Model Penal Code. In general, it makes abortion a crime, except when "performed by a physician duly licensed" in Georgia when, "based upon his best clinical judgment . . . an abortion is necessary because (1) [a] continuation of the pregnancy would endanger the life of the pregnant woman or would seriously and permanently injure her health, or (2) the fetus would very likely be born with a grave, permanent, and irremediable mental or physical defect, or (3) the pregnancy resulted from forcible or statutory rape."

The Georgia statute also provides that the woman must reside in Georgia, that two other physicians must concur with her own physician that an abortion is necessary, that the abortion must be performed in a hospital accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals, and that at least three members of the hospital's staff must concur.

The woman who initiated the action was married, but she alleged that she was physically and economically unable to care for the child. Her application for a therapeutic abortion under the Georgia statute was denied, and she filed suit in a three-judge district court, which granted her declaratory relief. The court also held that a number of others, including physicians, nurses, clergymen, and social workers, had standing to sue but had presented no justiciable controversy. 319 F. Supp. 1048. Again speaking through Mr. Justice Blackmun, the Supreme Court modified and affirmed the holding.

Basically, the Court held unconstitutional the provisions of the Georgia statute that prohibited abortions before the ending of the first trimester of a pregnancy and struck down the provisions requiring residency in the state, J.C.A.H. accreditation, approval of a hospital committee, and the concurrence of two other physicians.

There were three opinions concurring in

these two abortion cases, one by the Chief Justice that stated that he was "somewhat troubled" that the Court had taken notice of various scientific and medical data, but that he did not think it had exceeded the scope of accepted judicial notice. He also disagreed with the "sweeping consequences" attributed to the decision by the dissenting justices, saying, "Plainly, the Court today rejects any claim that the Constitution requires abortion on demand."

The second concurring opinion was by Justice Douglas, who stressed the "right of privacy" aspects of the cases.

The third concurring opinion by Justice Stewart emphasized the fact that the case was being decided on Fourteenth Amendment grounds.

Justice White, joined by Justice Rehnquist, wrote a short but vigorous dissent that called the decisions "an exercise of raw judicial power." The abortion issue, he argued, "should be left with the people and to the political processes the people have devised to govern their affairs."

Justice Rehnquist's dissent in the Texas case complained that the Court's holding was much broader than necessary to decide the case and that it was in effect a return to the philosophy of substantive due process. "The decision here to break the term of pregnancy into three distinct terms and to outline the permissible restrictions the State may impose in each one, for example, partakes more of judicial legislation than it does of a determination of the intent of the drafters of the Fourteenth Amendment," he declared.

#### THE BURDENS AND BENEFITS OF REPRESENTATION

##### HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the people that elect a Representative or Senator to the U.S. Congress have a right to expect that person to represent them on all matters that come before the House or Senate, respectively.

At no time in recent history has the responsibility been more clear for dedicated effort in the essential service to the people of America.

Nowhere in government service is representation more important than in the legislative process in a democracy because that is the business of the people.

I submit today for appropriate reference, proposed legislation to require the attendance of Members of Congress on not less than 75 percent of the recorded votes in the House and Senate. The language of the legislation that I have proposed is as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the Congress that—*

If during any period of one or more consecutive sessions of Congress, an individual holding the office of Senator or Representative fails to be recorded in person on 75 percent of three hundred consecutive recorded or rollcall votes of the House of which he or she is a Member, taken during a session of the Congress, such office shall become vacant, and the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, shall notify the executive authority of the State from which such individual was elected of the vacancy.

This resolution shall apply with respect to any recorded or rollcall vote of the next succeeding session of the Congress after adoption.

The Congress shall have the power to enforce this resolution by appropriate legislation.

#### SILVER DOLLAR CITY

##### HON. GENE TAYLOR

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. TAYLOR of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the foothills of the Missouri Ozarks, the re-created 19th century town of Silver Dollar City continues to attract nationwide attention because of its role in preserving the culture and craftsmanship of America in the 1800's. A visitor to the city during the spring and summer months will have the rare opportunity to see craftsmen working on these now historic trades. Over two dozen crafts are practiced including glass blowing, basket weaving, woodcarving, candlemaking, gunsmithing, and blacksmithing.

One unique craft found at Silver Dollar City is the art of building chuck wagons and Conestoga wagons. The nationwide demand and interest in this 19th century mode of transportation was the subject of a page 1 story in today's Wall Street Journal.

Through the preservation of such skills our Nation's pride and heritage will be passed on to future generations. This article will be of interest to all who share my interest in preserving our cultural heritage.

The article follows:

#### THE BOOMING ECONOMY (OR SOMETHING) SPURS CHUCK-WAGON DEMAND

(By David P. Garino)

SILVER DOLLAR CITY, Mo.—The economy is booming, and backlogs of orders are building: for machine tools, bulldozers, power shovels, cement mixers, conveyors, motor trucks. And, of course, for chuck wagons.

The nation's only wagon works can't keep up with demand. Here at Silver Dollar City, a park with a crafts-making theme in the Ozark Mountains, the current backlog is 25 chuck wagons (at \$600) and pony wagons (at \$450), enough to keep the works working through 1974. The shop started filling orders two years ago, and since then has sold and delivered 15 vehicles, including four new Conestoga wagons at \$2,500 each.

Wagon making is one of two dozen more or less esoteric crafts practiced at Silver Dollar City; some of the others are gunsmithing, blacksmithing, basket weaving and candle making. The park was started in 1960 by Mary B. Herschend, a 73-year-old widow, and now it employs 650 workers at its peak season, May through October, when it gets most of its million yearly visitors. Mrs. Herschend and her sons Peter and Jack manage the park. Unincorporated, Silver Dollar City covers 2,000 acres along a mountain ridge near Branson, Mo.

#### HAND TOOLS AND A FORGE

Thomas E. (Lucky) Jones does most of the wagon building. A bearded, 47-year-old Oklahoman, Mr. Jones says he may be the only active wheelwright in the country. He learned his trade as a youth from his forebears, and he recalls operating the bellows on his grandfather's forge—which he inherited and now uses—at Peak Ridge, Ark. He retreated

to the leisurely Ozarks after working several years in a factory in Los Angeles, where, he says, he "couldn't stand all the hubbub."

With his young apprentice, Lucky can put together a chuck wagon or a pony wagon in a month, and a Conestoga in 90 days to two months. He uses no power tools; his main implements are a mallet, knives, chisels and the iron forge. Wheel making is the most complicated and time-consuming part of wagon building. Lucky picks up a wheel to show how the spacing along the rim between the spokes must be exact—in this case 7.864 inches—or the wheel won't be round "and you start all over again."

"Any wheel is beautiful to me," he adds. "It makes me feel very big inside when I see one I've built. If there isn't someone around to build these things, kids will never know what they were." Lucky sells a lot of wheels in some 50 different sizes to people who use them as decorations and table bases. A 24-inch wheel fetches \$70, a 48-inch \$95.

Lucky's Conestoga wagons are built from diagrams from the Smithsonian Institution and from other details from an old reference book he keeps on hand. He has the exact, authentic specifications: height, 11½ feet; length, 19½ feet; weight, 3,600 pounds (The sturdy wagons could carry 20 tons of cargo.)

#### AND NEXT, RICKSHAS

His reference work says the original Conestogas were made of "genuine white oak, not red oak, nor chestnut, nor Spanish oak, nor any other one of the two dozen varieties that now pass for oak." So Lucky uses white oaks. There's plenty around, but the fresh-cut lumber has to be doused and sprayed with boiling linseed oil and bug killers to keep it flexible and insect free. Then it has to be dried for two to five years.

The first customer for one of his Conestogas was Roman Stegeman, who owns a museum featuring vintage cars and horse vehicles in Toas, Mo. Mr. Stegeman says he could find no other source for a Conestoga. Another wagon was purchased by a shopping center with a Western motif in Kansas City, Mo. And a group in Sharon Spring, Kan., bought one for the restoration of Fort Wallace.

One of the first chuck wagons was bought by Empire Gas Co. of Lebanon, Mo. The company uses it for promotion, and two years ago at a gathering after the annual meeting a buffet dinner was served from it.

Dr. Charles Kelley, a dentist from Plano, Texas, bought a pony wagon for his teen-aged daughters Nancy and Mary Helen. He figured it would be safer than a mini-bike. Then he had to shell out more than \$200 for a pair of mules, and, he says, "things just didn't pan out the way we thought they would. A friend of ours hitched up the mules and they took off like mad. Fortunately, he wasn't hurt."

The mules haven't been hitched up again, and Dr. Kelley is wondering now whether to sell the wagon or buy some Shetland ponies to draw it. Meanwhile, he says, "the girls have saddled and ridden the mules, so it wasn't a total loss."

If your mules are perverse, Lucky still can fix you up. For a Missouri man he is going to make a ricksha, and, he says, "you draw it and we'll make it."

#### U.S. ALLY IN MIDEAST—IRAN— UNDER ATTACK

#### HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, Iran is one of the few remaining friends of the

United States in the Middle East, and our enemies in the Communist world are only too well aware of this fact. In order to undermine the Shah of Iran, East Germany has been running a clandestine radio station broadcasting material designed to overthrow the Shah. Recently, Iran got East Germany to agree to cease this activity and in a typical Communist tactic, the transmitter was moved out of East Germany and into Iraq, which has a Communist dominated, if not controlled government, where it is now going full blast. Therefore, I believe the article from the Daily Telegraph of London of April 17, 1973, is instructive in this regard and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

#### ANTI-PERSIAN RADIO MOVES TO IRAQ IN PROPAGANDA WAR

(By John Bulloch in Beirut)

A Communist-run radio station which attacks the Shah of Persia and his Government has moved from East Germany to Iraq as the undeclared conflict between these neighboring countries intensifies.

I was told yesterday that Persian diplomats consider the move a breach of the spirit of an agreement they entered into with East Germany.

One of the provisions of that agreement, signed last December, was that Persia would open diplomatic relations with East Germany provided that the hostile broadcasts were halted.

East Germany has carried out the letter of the agreement, but has clearly breached its spirit by transferring the stations to Northern Iraq.

The clandestine transmitter, situated somewhere near the border with Persia, broadcasts 25 hours a week in Farsi, the language of Persia, Kurdish, and two other minority languages. The main news is that of the banned and exiled Tudeh, the Persian Communist party.

According to Western diplomats, establishment of the radio station in Iraq is one of the by-products of the Iraq-Soviet friendship treaty signed a year ago.

It marks increasing domination of the Iraqi Government by pro-Communist elements, rather than the more independent-minded Baath party members, who have been in control up to now.

Persia and Iraq are competing for the position of most powerful nation in the Persian Gulf area with Persia well ahead.

Iraq realises it cannot go to war with its stronger neighbour, and is therefore trying to stir up internal trouble while backing dissidents with occasional border incidents.

#### JANE FONDA DUPED BY HANOI

#### HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the anger of our returned prisoners of war at the activities of Jane Fonda has begun to boil over. Subjected to the carefully orchestrated visits of Miss Fonda to the Hanoi Hilton, the POW's are now expressing their outrage at her trips to North Vietnam and her inexhaustible desire to consort with the enemy. I would like to share with my House colleagues an article from the April 3 San Diego Evening Tribune regarding the recent remarks of Navy captain, and former POW,

#### William Franke before the Rotary Club: EX-POW CLAIMS "JANE, BABY," DUPED BY HANOI

(By Ernie Cowan)

VALLEY CENTER.—Antiwar activist Jane Fonda was known to U.S. prisoners of war in the "Hanoi Hilton" as "Jane, baby," a returned POW said here yesterday.

"And we have no love for 'Jane, baby,'" Navy Capt. William Franke told a group of more than 50 Rotary Club members and guests.

He was shot down in August 1965 and was reported killed in action. His name never appeared on any POW lists until his release. Other pilots who saw him go down reported he couldn't have survived.

Franke said visits by "peace delegations" to North Vietnam were a source of anger for prisoners housed in the "Hanoi Hilton." "We all felt that even in an undeclared war these people shouldn't be over there and be friendly with the enemy," Franke said.

He said Miss Fonda got what the prisoners called "Tour Alpha" and was shown what the North Vietnamese wanted her to see.

"I think Jane, baby, is a little twisted in the mind. It surprised me how a person with her background and knowledge could be so duped and deceived by those people so as to place herself in the position she is in today," Franke said.

"She is now saying the prisoners are liars and I hate to hear that from a woman that should be as educated as she is. But she did come over and she made statements and she was deceived and duped at every turn and she was shown things they wanted her to see and she believed what they told her."

Franke said Miss Fonda then came home to America and tried to discourage American soldiers from fighting and to tell the public how well the prisoners were being cared for.

"Well, she's a liar. She doesn't know anything about the situation and I think she's twisted upstairs," Franke said.

During his more-than-seven years captivity Franke said the North Vietnamese taught him to hate them.

"I don't hate the people of North Vietnam, but they taught me to hate their system and their leaders and for that reason I am against any help to that country," Franke said.

Despite being treated as "the blackest of criminals," Franke said there was organization and strength among the prisoners.

"That's all we had, was strength among the group to keep us going," he said.

At times prisoners were taken into Hanoi where pictures would be taken of them next to ruined buildings.

"We would resist these attempts at propaganda and it took 17 guards to move seven of us, and we would fight them, so that we were beaten, bloodied and manacled when we arrived," Franke said. "The photographers were not interested in pictures of us that way, so we had accomplished our purpose."

#### VITAMIN BILL SPONSORS NOW NUMBER 142

#### HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, as of May 9, 1973, a total of 142 Members of the House have cosponsored or introduced H.R. 643 and identical bills relating to FDA regulations concerning vitamins and dietary supplements. Interest in



these bills is gaining momentum as shown by the fact that on March 8 only 20 Congressmen had cosponsored them. This interest is nationwide and bipartisan. I appreciate the support of my colleagues. The list of cosponsors and sponsors follow:

CONGRESSMEN INTRODUCING IDENTICAL BILLS,  
AND CONGRESSMEN JOINING MR. HOSMER AS  
COSPONSORS—AS OF MAY 4, 1973

## ALABAMA

1. Beville, Tom (D. HR 7474).
2. Buchanan, John (D. HR 7473).
3. Edwards, Jack (R. HR 7474).
4. Nichols, Bill (D. HR 7474).

## ALASKA

1. Young, Don (R. HR 6045).

## ARIZONA

1. Conlan, John B. (D. HR 6043).
2. Rhodes, John J. (R. HR 3483).
3. Steiger, Sam (R. HR 6044).
4. Udall, Morris K. (D. HR 7201).

## ARKANSAS

1. Hammerschmidt, J. (R. HR 6043).

## CALIFORNIA

1. Anderson, Glenn M. (D. HR 5313).
2. Brown, George E. (D. HR 6787).
3. Burgener, Clair W. (R. HR 6043).
4. Clawson, Del. (R. HR 3245).
5. Corman, James C. (D. HR 7473).
6. Danielson, George (D. HR 6098).
7. Goldwater, Barry, Jr. (R. HR 6043).
8. Gubser, Charles (D. HR 4790).
9. Hanna, Richard T. (D. HR 6043).
10. Hawkins, Augustus (D. HR 6045).
11. Hinshaw, Andrew J. (R. HR 7473).
12. Hosmer, Craig (R. HR 643).
13. Ketcham, William (R. HR 6044).
14. Leggett, R. L. (D. HR 6044).
15. Moorhead, Carlos J. (R. HR 6044).
16. Pettis, Jerry L. (R. HR 894).
17. Rees, Thomas M. (D. HR 6044).
18. Rousselot, John H. (R. HR 7474).
19. Royball, Edward R. (D. HR 7241).
20. Ryan, Leo J. (R. HR 6044).
21. Sisk, B. F. (D. HR 5083).
22. Talcott, Burt (R. HR 6044).
23. Teague, Charles M. (R. HR 6044).
24. Walde, Jerome R. (D. HR 4568).
25. Wilson, Bob (R. HR 6045).
26. Wilson, Charles (D. HR 2932).

## CONNECTICUT

1. Grasso, Ella T. (D. HR 7473).
2. Steele, Robert H. (R. HR 7474).

## FLORIDA

1. Bafalis, L. S. Skip (R. HR 7473).
2. Burke, Herbert J. (R. HR 6043).
3. Fascell, Dante B. (D. HR 7473).
4. Haley, James A. (D. HR 7474).
5. Lehman, William (D. HR 6787).
6. Pepper, Claude (R. HR 6044).
7. Young, C. W. Bill (R. HR 1295).

## GEORGIA

1. Mathis, Dawson (D. HR 7473).

## HAWAII

1. Matsunaga, Spark (D. HR 770).

## IDAHO

1. Symms, Steve D. (R. HR 7474).

## ILLINOIS

1. Anderson, John B. (R. HR 6043).
2. Annunzio, Frank (D. HR 6209).
3. Collier, Harold R. (R. HR 3236).
4. Crane, Phillip M. (R. HR 6043).
5. McClory, Robert (R. HR 7473).
6. Michel, Robert H. (R. HR 7473).
7. O'Brien, George M. (R. HR 6107).
8. Railsback, Tom (R. HR 6044).

## INDIANA

1. Bray, William G. (R. HR 6043).
2. Hudnut, William H. (R. HR 6044).
3. Myers, John T. (R. HR 6044).
4. Zion, Roger H. (R. HR 6045).

## IOWA

1. Gross, H. R. (R. HR 7473).

## KANSAS

1. Shriver, Garner E. (R. HR 6044).

## LOUISIANA

1. Rarick, John R. (D. HR 1617).
2. Treen, David C. (R. HR 7474).

## MASSACHUSETTS

1. Studts, Gerry E. (D. HR 7474).

## MICHIGAN

1. Brown, Gary (R. HR 6043).
2. Cederberg, Elford (R. HR 135).
3. Chamberlain, Chas. (R. HR 6043).
4. Conyers, John (D. HR 7473).
5. Diggs, Charles (D. HR 7473).
6. Esch, Mervin (R. HR 7473).
7. Ford, Gerald R. (R. HR 7473).
8. Hutchinson, Edward (R. HR 5789).

## MINNESOTA

1. Blatnik, John A. (D. HR 5390).
2. Karth, Joseph E. (D. HR 7479).
3. Zwach, John (R. HR 6856).
4. Frenzel, Bill (R.).

## MISSISSIPPI

1. Lott, Trent (R. HR 7473).

## MISSOURI

1. Randall, William (D. HR 4667).

## MONTANA

1. Shoup, Richard G. (R. HR 6045).

## NEBRASKA

1. Thone, Charles (R. HR 6044).

## NEVADA

1. Towell, David (R. HR 6044).

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Wyman, Louis C. (R. HR 5395).
2. James C. Cleveland (R.).

## NEW JERSEY

1. Forsythe, Edwin B. (R. HR 6043).
2. Helstoski, Henry (D. HR 1782).
3. Howard, James J. (D. HR 6726).
4. Hunt, John E. (R. HR 6043).
5. Roe, Robert A. (D. HR 6044).

## NEW MEXICO

1. Runnels, Harold (D.).

## NEW YORK

1. Abzug, Bella S. (D. HR 7474).
2. Addabbo, Joseph P. (D. HR 7473).
3. Brasco, Frank J. (D. HR 7473).
4. Dulski, Thaddeus (D. HR 2670).
5. Fish, Hamilton (R. HR 6043).
6. Horton, Frank (R. HR 6043).
7. Rangel, Charles (D. HR 6787).
8. Robison, Howard (R. HR 7474).
9. Roncallo, Angelo (R. HR 6787).
10. Rosenthal, Benjamin (D. HR 6044).
11. Walsh, William F. (R. HR 7474).

## NORTH CAROLINA

1. Jones, Walter B. (D. HR 7473).
2. Mizell, Wilmer (R. HR 7474).

## OHIO

1. Carney, Charles J. (D. HR 7473).
2. Clancy, Donald D. (R. HR 4611).
3. Minshall, William (R. HR 6044).
4. Regula, Ralph S. (R. HR 7474).
5. Seiberling, John F. (D. HR 7474).

## OKLAHOMA

1. Jarman, John (D. HR 6519).

## OREGON

1. Dellenback, John (R. HR 6043).
2. Wyatt, Wendell (R. HR 2483).

## PENNSYLVANIA

1. Clark, Frank M. (D. HR 6043).
2. Coughlin, Lawrence (R. HR 6787).
3. Eshleman, Edwin (R. HR 7473).
4. Gaydos, Joseph M. (D. HR 7474).
5. Goodling, George A. (R. HR 6043).
6. Saylor, John (R. HR 1897).
7. Ware, John (R. HR 6044).
8. Yatron, Gus (D. HR 6045).
9. Nix, Robert (D. HR 6580).

## SOUTH CAROLINA

1. Davis, Mendel J. (D. HR 7473).
2. Spence, Floyd (R. HR 7474).

## SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Abdnor, James (R. HR 7473).

## TENNESSEE

1. Baker, LaMar (R. HR 6787).
2. Duncan, John T. (R. HR 6043).
3. Fulton, Richard H. (D. HR 7106).
4. Kuykendall, Dan (R. HR 6787).

## TEXAS

1. Archer, Bill (R. HR 6043).
2. Casey, Bob (D. HR 2263).
3. Collins, James M. (R. HR 6043).
4. Fisher, O. C. (D. HR 6043).
5. Pickle, J. J. (D. HR 7474).
6. Teague, Olin E. (D. HR 7474).
7. Wright, Jim (D. HR 6045).

## VIRGINIA

1. Broyhill, Joel T. (R. HR 6043).
2. Whitehurst, G. W. (R. HR 7474).

## WASHINGTON

1. Hicks, Floyd V. (D. HR 6043).

## WEST VIRGINIA

1. Slack, John M. (D. HR 7474).

## WISCONSIN

1. Froehlich, Harold (R. HR 7473).
2. Thomson, Vernon W. (R. HR 7474).

## GUAM

1. Won Pat, Antonio B. (D. HR 6045).

## A SALUTE TO THE NEWBORN SPECIAL CARE NURSERY OF ST. FRANCIS HOSPITAL DURING NATIONAL HOSPITAL WEEK

### HON. JAMES R. JONES

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 9, 1973

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, today, as a continuation of my tribute to the hospitals in my district during National Hospital Week, I should like to cite a particular demonstration of community responsibility. As you know, there is no charitable hospital system in the State of Oklahoma. The care of the poor is therefore provided by the private hospitals.

St. Francis Hospital, a private 725-bed, 50-bassinet hospital founded by the William K. Warren Foundation, has developed an innovative service program by providing imaginative modern care to all pregnant females and to all high-risk infants through a special newborn nursery staffed with newborn specialists—neonologists. The emphasis of this effort is not the mere salvage of human life, but on salvaging quality, neurologically intact future citizens.

The identified need to make such facilities available has been met by St. Francis Hospital by the establishment in 1971 of a regional newborn referral nursery to serve northeastern Oklahoma. This newborn special care nursery boasts two trained newborn specialists, sophisticated monitoring and respiratory equipment, a cadre of highly motivated nurses, an active educational program and a comprehensive training facility for newborn specialists. Regional endorsement of this privately funded effort is reflected in the

surge of referrals which grew in numbers from 17 in 1971 to 78 in 1972. The referral of 100 to 150 high-risk infants is anticipated in 1973. Statistics on those infants born at St. Francis Hospital indicate that newborn mortality rates have been cut in half.

The success of these private medical endeavors to provide a service to all regardless of ability to pay is greatly strengthened by the simultaneous development of perinatal research efforts through the William K. Warren Research Center, a facility adjacent to St. Francis Hospital. The provocative questions

such as hyaline membrane disease, neonatal pulmonary hemorrhage, neonatal infection, fetal monitoring, and newborn energy metabolism which are being actively researched in the center, provide important clinical support for the newborn special care nursery and maternity unit.

The present newborn special care nursery can accommodate up to 14 critically ill newborn infants. The \$20 million gift for further expansion of St. Francis Hospital which was announced in December of 1972 includes plans to double the size of the newborn special care

nursery. Support for the perinatal efforts at St. Francis Hospital extends beyond the clinical research at the half a million dollar research center. The St. Francis Hospital Auxiliary has given the major part of the \$50,000 donations from 1971 and 1972 for important support equipment in the nursery and maternity unit.

It is indeed refreshing to see a privately funded health care facility identify such a broad health need and to quietly proceed to make an impact toward rendering that need which can benefit an entire State.

## SENATE—Thursday, May 10, 1973

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we give Thee thanks for the accomplishments of yesterday, for the rest of the night that is past and for the promise of this new day. Let this day add some knowledge or good deed to yesterday. Light up all our labors, even the small duties, by a vivid awareness of Thy presence. Give us wisdom and grace to make this world a better place and our Nation a worthier servant of Thy purposes. And when the day is done, bring us to rest with joy and peace in our hearts.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., May 10, 1973.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. ABOUREZK thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 8, 1973, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1494) to amend section 236 of the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for certain employees to limit the num-

ber of employees that may be retired under such act during specified periods.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ABOUREZK) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Mayo J. Thompson, of Texas, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 9, 1973, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nominations in the Department of Defense as follows:

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Howard H. Callaway, of Georgia, to be Secretary of the Army.

#### NOMINATION OF HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to recommend to the Senate

favorable action on the pending nomination of former Congressman Howard H. Callaway as the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. Callaway's nomination has been approved unanimously by the Senate Armed Services Committee. Early action by the Senate would facilitate this matter in view of the resignation of the current Army Secretary Robert F. Froehle, which becomes effective May 15.

Mr. President, the nominee is a man of ability and integrity. As a cadet at the U.S. Military Academy he demonstrated outstanding leadership qualities before graduating in the top part of his class in 1949.

Following his graduation he served as an infantry lieutenant during the Korean war, earning the Combat Infantryman's Badge and other decorations.

In other words, Mr. Callaway is not only an outstanding businessman, former civic leader, and former Congressman, but he is also a man who knows the Army by virtue of his service at the Academy and in combat.

Mr. President, the Nation is fortunate to have a man of Mr. Callaway's caliber as its Secretary of the Army. President Nixon is to be commended for this outstanding appointment and I urge the Senate to act promptly in confirming this nomination.

#### NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. HILL

Mr. President, I rise to urge the Senate act favorably on the pending nomination of Ambassador Robert C. Hill for the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs.

Ambassador Hill has a distinguished record of public service as evidenced by his work within the State Department and more recently as Ambassador to Spain.

The Nation is fortunate that Ambassador Hill has consented to President Nixon's request that he reenter public life in the important position as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs.

This is an important and sensitive post for which the nominee is well qualified. Few men in public life have the skill and judgment already demonstrated by Ambassador Hill.

Mr. President, the nominee is a man of character and ability. It is my hope the